LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 26 1971
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

IN THE

United States Supreme Court

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

70-134

No. ~~1635~~

FRED G. AMICK,

Petitioner,

vs

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent,

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

VANCE M. WAGGONER
130 East Second Street
Rushville, Indiana, 46173
Counsel for Petitioner

INDEX

	Page
Citations To Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	2
Constitutional Provisions, Statutes and Federal Rules Involved	4
Statement of Facts	7
Reasons For Granting Writ of Certiorari	11
I.	11
II.	13
III.	15
IV.	19
Appendix	
A. Opinions and Judgments Below	1a
Order of Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit Denying Petitioner's Petition For Rehearing on March 29, 1971	34a
B. Sample Cases Where Hearings Were Granted	35a
Proof of Service	36a

LIST OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases

Page

Exparte Bain, 1887. 121 U.S.1, 7S Ct. 781, 30L. Ed. 899 13

Jeffers v. United States, C.A.9th 1968, 392 F. 2d 749 13

Rabinowitz v. United States, 366 F. 2d 34 (5th Cir., 1966) 16, 19

Stirone v. United States, 1960, 361 U.S. 212, 805, Ct. 270, 4L. Ed. 2d 252 13

United States v. Birrell (S.D.N.Y., 1967) 226 F. Supp. 539 13

United States v. Boyce Motor Lines, D.C.N.J., 1950, 90F. Supp. 996 12

United States v. Inke, 263F. Supp. 828 (S.D.Ind., 1967).... 18

United States v. Leonette, 291F. Supp. 461, 463 (S.D.N.Y., 1968) 18

United States v. McCulloch, D.C.Ind., 1947, 6 F.R.D. 559 11

United States v. Spector, C.A. 7th 1963, 326F. 2d 345, 346-348 14

Whitus v. Georgia (1967) 385 U.S. 545, 550, 17L. Ed. 2d 599, 604 17

Witcher v. Payton, 40SF. 2d 725 (4th Cir., 1969) 17

Constitution, Statutes and Federal Rules

U. S. Constitution, Amendment 5 ..... 4, 11, 13

U. S. Constitution, Amendment 6 ..... 4, 11

15 U.S.C. Sec. 77q (a) 5

28 U.S.C. Sec. 1861 5

6 (b) (2), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5

7 (c), (d), (e), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 6

8 (a), (b), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 6

13, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 7

14, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 7

Miscellaneous

1967 Judicial Conference Report, 42 F.R.D. 353 (1967) .. 16

Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., p. 1353 17

Barron & Holtzoff, Federal Practice and Procedure, Vol. 4, Ch. 19, Sec. 1913, Vol. 5, Ch. 73, Sec. 4540 12

Fed. Pract. & Proced., Wright, Vol. 1, Ch. 4, Sec. 127 14

IN THE

United States Supreme Court

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

No._____

FRED G. AMICK,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit entered in the case of *UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. FRED G. AMICK, ET AL.** on January 22, 1971, rehearing denied March 29, 1971.

*Appellants in the entitled case other than Fred G. Amick were Francis L. Broderick, William M. Dowling, K. K. Irving, David R. Mayne, Gilbert E. McQuinn, H. R. Nash, Walter C. Olsen, Leon O. Riggs, Van C. Vollmer, Harold L. Wymer, Indiana Investor & Business News, Inc., and Securities Services, Inc. Each appellant's case was separately docketed but consolidated for purposes of filing an appendix and oral argument. K. K. Irving filed his Petition for Writ of Certiorari on February 22, 1971 in the United States Supreme Court; certain other Appellants timely filed petitions for rehearing, respectively; petitions for rehearing of Amick, Broderick, Dowling, Nash, Olsen, Wymer, Van Vollmer, and Indiana Investor and Business News, Inc. were denied March 29, 1971.

CITATIONS TO OPINIONS BELOW

Judgment without opinion of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division. was entered against Petitioner on July 28, 1967, on verdict of the jury finding said Petitioner guilty of Counts 6. 10. 12, 13. 14, 15, 18, and 20 of indictment. The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit affirming judgment is reported in _____F2d_____ and is reprinted in Appendix A, p. 1a; the order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit denying Petitioner's petition for rehearing on March 29, 1971 is reprinted in Appendix A, p. 34a.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals was entered on January 22, 1971, reprinted in Appendix A, p. 1a, petition for rehearing denied March 29, 1971, reprinted in Appendix A, p. 34a. The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254 (1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Was Petitioner denied due process of law in that the indictment, and each of the Counts thereof, charging him does not charge him with any offense against the laws of the United States?

2. Was Petitioner denied due process of law in that the indictment, and each of the Counts thereof, charging him does charge him within each of said Counts with a multiplicity of criminal offenses against the laws of the United States to the extent that Petitioner could not know the nature of the charge against him and could not adequately prepare and make his defense thereto?
   Did Petitioner commit a separate crime each time he allegedly used the United States Mail in violation of 15 U.S.C. §77q (a) (Section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933), or is the use of the United States Mail necessary only to invoke Federal jurisdiction?

3. Was Petitioner denied due process of law in that the indictment, and each Count thereof, contains such highly

immaterial, irrelevant, prejudicial, and inflammatory allegations that Petitioner was denied a fair and impartial trial thereunder because the Jury which had before it said indictment would necessarily be prejudiced against Petitioner with such improper allegations?

4. Was Petitioner denied due process of law in that the indictment, and each Count thereof, is so vague, indefinite and uncertain that Petitioner could not understand and was not advised the nature of the charges against him and could not adequately prepare and make his defense thereto?

5. Was Petitioner denied due process of law in being tried before a Jury, after dismissal of Count 1 of the indictment by the trial court, on twenty-seven additional Counts of said indictment which incorporate the first three paragraphs of Count 1 (a four paragraph count) by reference?

   Did the trial judge amend the indictment by permitting the Jury to have before it during its deliberation the first three paragraphs of previously dismissed Count 1 and the additional twenty-seven counts which included these paragraphs of Count 1 by reference thus usurping the Grand Jury function and denying Petitioner due process of law?

6. Was Petitioner entitled to an evidentiary hearing upon a prima facie showing that the Grand Jury that indicted him was improperly selected, drawn, constituted, and arrayed so as not to represent a cross section of the community?

7. Was the Grand Jury that indicted Petitioner illegally and unconstitutionally summoned, selected, drawn, and arrayed in that a representative cross section of the community was not obtained?

8. Was the Petit Jury or Trial Jury before whom trial of Petitioner was had illegally and unconstitutionally summoned, selected, drawn and arrayed in that a representative cross section of the community was not obtained?

9. Was there substantial evidence of probative value adduced on trial of Petitioner (taking the view most favorable to the Government and without weighing conflicting evidence or testing the credibility of witnesses) to support the Jury's verdict finding Petitioner guilty of Counts 6. 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, and 20, as charged in the indictment, where the law presumes Petitioner innocent until the instant the Jury renders its verdict to the contrary and where the law requires the Government prosecuting to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each material element of each criminal offense charged upon which there is conviction of Petitioner?

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND FEDERAL RULES INVOLVED

1. United States Constitution, Amendment 5.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment by a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

2. United States Constitution, Amendment 6

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state or district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

3. 15 U.S.C. § 77q (a)

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person in the offer or sale of any securities by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by the use of the mails, directly or indirectly —

"(1) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud, or

"(2) to obtain money or property by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, or

"(3) to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser."

4. 28 U.S.C. § 1861 (prior to 1968 Amendment)

"Any citizen of the United States who has attained the age of twenty-one years and who has resided for a period of one year within the judicial district, is competent to serve as a grand or petit juror unless —

"(1) He has been convicted in a State or Federal court of record of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year and his civil rights have not been restored by pardon or amnesty.

"(2) He is unable to read, write, speak, and understand the English language.

"(3) He is incapable, by reason of mental or physical infirmities to render efficient jury service."

5. Rule 6(b) (2) Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

"(2) Motion to Dismiss. A motion to dismiss the indictment may be based on objections to the array or on the lack of legal qualification of an individual juror, if not previously determined upon challenge. An indictment shall not be dismissed on ground that one or more

members of the grand jury were not legally qualified if it appears from the record kept pursuant to subdivision (c) of this rule that 12 or more jurors, after deducting the number not legally qualified, concurred in finding the indictment."

6. Rule 7 (c), (d), (e) Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

"(c) Nature and contents. The indictment or the information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government. It need not contain a formal commencement, a formal conclusion or any other matter not necessary to such statement. Allegations made in one count may be incorporated by reference in another count. It may be alleged in a single count that the means by which the defendant committed the offense are unknown or that he committed it by one or more specified means. The indictment or information shall state for each count the official or customary citation of the statute, rule, regulation or other provision of law which the defendant is alleged therein to have violated. Error in the citation or its omission shall not be ground for dismissal of the indictment or information or for reversal of a conviction if the error or omission did not mislead the defendant to his prejudice.

"(d) Surplusage. The court on motion of the defendant may strike surplusage from the indictment or information.

"(e) Amendment of information. The court may permit an information to be amended at any time before verdict or finding if no additional or different offense is charged and if substantial rights of the defendant are not prejudiced."

7. Rule 8 (a), (b) Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

"(a) Joinder of offenses. Two or more offenses may be charged in the same indictment or information in a separate count for each offense if the offenses charged,

whether felonies or misdemeanors or both, are of the same or similar character or are based on the same act or transactions or on two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan.

"(b) Joinder of defendants. Two or more defendants may be charged in the same indictment or information if they are alleged to have participated in the same act or transaction or in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. Such defendants may be charged in one or more counts together or separately and all of the defendants need not be charged in each count."

8. Rule 13, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

"The court may order two or more indictments or informations or both to be tried together if the offenses, and the defendants if there is more than one, could have been joined in a single indictment or information. The procedure shall be the same as if the prosecution were under such single indictment or information."

9. Rule 14, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

(Prior to July 1, 1966, effective date of 1966 Amendment; Grand Jury indictment was returned June 24, 1966)

"If it appears that a defendant or the government is prejudiced by a joinder of offenses or of defendants in an indictment or information or by such joinder for trial together, the court may order an election or separate trials of counts, grant a severance of defendants or provide whatever other relief justice requires."

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On June 24, 1966, Petitioner, Fred G. Amick, was charged by indictment, and in counts 1 through 38, inclusive, and each of them, respectively, with violations of § 77q (a) of the Securities and Exchange Act, and in each count of doing said acts or omissions to act "wilfully" thus bringing said defendant within the "punishable as principal" provision of

Title 18 U.S.C. § 2 as amended October 31, 1951, ch. 655 § 17b, 65 Stat, 717, said acts being punishable under conviction of a wilful violation of Title 15 U.S.C. §77q (a); under Title 15 U.S.C. §77x, May 27, 1933, ch. 38, Title I, § 24, 48 Stat. 87; Petitioner is charged in Count 40 under § 77e (a) (2), of doing said acts or omissions to act, id est, mailing an unregistered security interstate, "wilfully" thus bringing said defendant within the "punishable as principal" provision of said Title 18 U.S.C. § 2, said acts being punishable under conviction, and also under Title 15 U.S.C. § 77x; Petitioner is charged at Count 41 of said indictment with conspiracy in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. §371 "to commit certain offenses against the United States Government, to-wit:

> "Section 77e (a), 77q (a), 77q (b), Title 15 U.S.C., in the manner and means setforth more fully in counts 1 through 40 of this indictment.",

said Count 41 being identified as "10 U.S.C. 371", which Section of the United States Code is non existent.

Each Counts 1 through 38, respectively, charge not one but several crimes as delineated under Title 15 U.S.C. § 77q (a); the body of the indictement occupies 40 pages of the printed Appendix on Appeal, 16 pages of said Appendix being the allegations of the first three paragraphs of Count 1, which is incorporated by reference in each of the next succeeding 37 Counts of said indictment without reprinting; the indictment charges 29 defendants in various of the 41 Counts thereof; prior to trial, Count 40 was dismissed; Counts 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 27, 31, 36 and 37 were each dismissed at the conclusion of the Government's case and Count 35 was dismissed prior to submission of the case to the jury; each of the defendants were acquitted, not guilty, on Count 41, the conspiracy charge.

Robert S. Chappell, Investment Corporation of America, Bennie L. Ritchison and Chappell Securities Corporation (the Chappell interests) were each on May 22, 1968 severed for trial at a later date; on November 14, 1967, they were each found not guilty after a two week jury trial; seven of the defendants entered pleas of nolo contendere and three of said defendants, Irving, McQuinn and Nash appeal from

the Court's judgment on said plea; two of the defendants, G. N. Van Horn and Bert Chesnut testified as government witnesses in the trial of the cause; thereafter on January 29, 1969, Van Horn received a five year suspended sentence and the case against his company, another defendant, G. N. Van Horn & Associates, an Indiana securities broker-dealer was dismissed by the Government; on January 20, 1969 Chesnut received a five year suspended sentence.

The successor corporation of G. N. Van Horn & Associates was Commercial Capital Corporation, another defendant; it was Van Horn and his companies who handled the public offerings of the stock of Air & Space Underwriters, Inc.; it was Van Horn who brought the Chappell interests into Air and Space Companies; it was Van Horn who borrowed money from Chappell to loan to the Air and Space Companies; it was Van Horn and his companies who secured a preferred position with Air and Space securities; this was all over Petitioner's opposition; it was Chesnut who was the accountant for Van Horn's companies and for the Chappell interests and for Securities Services which Chappell had organized and financed in the summer of 1964.

Petitioner was charged in 40 Counts of the 41 Count indictment and was convicted on 8 Counts, being Counts 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, and 20, and was sentenced to a total of 6 years imprisonment subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 4208 (a) (2), as follows: 4 years on Count 6 and 2 years on Count 10 to run consecutively; 2 years on the remaining Counts to run concurrently with the sentence imposed on Count 10.

Petitioner, and defendant K. K. Irving, and one of Mr. Irving's brothers acquired a dealership, later one or more distributorships, in Umbaugh Aircraft Corporation in 1959; in the purchase price of their dealership and distributorships and expenses of acquisition of the interests of the bankrupt corporations, Umbaugh Aircraft Corporation and Peace River Manufacturing Corporation, these three persons had roughly $300,000.00 invested in trying to make and sell autogyro aircraft; these three persons in attempting to put the plan for purchase out of bankruptcy together

in 1963 acquired through K. K. Irving the services of Van Horn and Chesnut as persons knowledgeable in securities and business practices; an Indiana corporation, Air & Space Underwriters, Inc., was formed by these 5 people; the corporation filed its Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in the bankruptcy of Umbaugh Aircraft and Peace River in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division, on July 22, 1963, which the Court approved on August 14, 1963; included in the plan of reorganization was the sale of stock by an intra-state public offering; the Florida Court further retained jurisdiction over the controversy between Air & Space Underwriters, Inc. and its subsidiary manufacturing corporation Air and Space Manufacturing, Inc., with E. G. Streets, Bernard McGowan and Raymond E. Umbaugh; Umbaugh testifying as a witness for the government on the trial of the cause herein, testified on cross examination that his claim and that of Streets was resolved by action of the Florida Courts as part of the bankruptcy proceedings.

Air & Space Underwriters, Inc., prompted and guided by Van Horn and Chesnut, particularly Van Horn, began the public stock offering which continued until June of 1965 when a civil action was commenced entitled *Securities & Exchange Commission v. Robert S. Chappell, et al.*, Cause No. IP 65-C-279; the trial judge in said civil action (the same trial judge who tried the case herein) after hearing on June 12, 1965, temporarily enjoined Air & Space Underwriters, Inc., and the other defendants from selling Air and Spaee stock.

The Air and Space companies were continuously under financial strain due to the fact that their parts suppliers, particularly in the case of the gears for the rotary head of the autogyro, did not deliver serviceable parts on contract commitments and further before production, the autogyro prototype required modification which modification required Federal Aeronautics Authority approval which was a year and a half in completion; this situation was not improved by the Securities and Exchange Commission filing a civil suit against the Air and Space Companies seeking an

injunction for the sale of stock of Air & Space Underwriters, Inc.; by January, 1965, Petitioner and the Irvings had exhausted their resources, were unable to secure other funding for the Air and Space Companies, and sold to the Chappell interests; in an agreement between Investment Corporation of America, Commercial Capital Corporation, and Irving Amick Aircraft Corporation, their 664,000 shares of Air & Space Underwriters, Inc. stock held by Irving Amick Aircraft Corporation were sold for $880,000.00 with Investment Corporation of America agreeing to furnish Air and Space Companies equity financing of $1,200,000.00.

The autogyro produced by the Air and Space Companies is an excellent and needed product.

Petitioner appealed to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals which affirmed the trial court; Petitioner then timely filed his Petition for Rehearing which was denied.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI

I.

PETITIONER WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS OF LAW WHEN TRIAL COURT REFUSED TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT UPON PETITIONER'S MOTION BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF QUESTION 1., 2., 3., AND 4., OF THIS PETITION.

No conspiracy is charged and Petitioner is not charged with conspiracy or with conspiracy to violate any of the laws of the United States in the indictment, Counts 1 through 38, inclusive, or any of them, or Count 40; therefore, the charge against this defendant in any one Count of said indictment should be a single identifiable charge of the criminal violation of an identifiable law of the United States, the violation of which is criminally proscribed or criminally penally sanctioned.

Constitution of the United States,
Amendments V, VI;

United States v. McCulloch, D. C. Ind., 1947, 6 F. R. D. 559.

"The Supreme Court has suggested approved forms of indictment."

Barron & Holtzoff, Federal Practice and Procedure, Vol. 4, ch. 19, § 1913, pp. 59, 60; Vol. 5, ch. 73, § 4540, pp. 668, 669; 1965 Pkt. Pt., Vol. 5, ch. 73, § 4540, c, pp. 164, 165, 166.

The indictment must clearly inform the defendant of the precise offense by which he is charged with a reasonable degree of certainty.

United States v. Boyce Motor Lines, D. C. N. J., 1950, 90 F. Supp. 996.

The indictment charging the defendant criminally is to be construed particularly and strictly against the pleading for the benefit and understanding of the defendant in his making adequate preparation in his defense thereto; which of the basic violations proscribed by Section 77q (a), Title 15, United States Code is intended to be alleged by the indictment, in each of the first 38 Counts thereof, the offer or sale of any securities "by use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce", or "by use of the mails."?

The indictment, Counts 1 through 38, inclusive, are apparently each intended to charge a criminal violation of the Securities and Exchange Act, Title 15, U.S.C., Section 77q (a); the unlawful acts proscribed by Section 77q (a) are several in number, distinguishable one from the other, distinctive, separable, alternative, individual, and properly chargeable only in separate indictments or separate counts of one indictment as related offenses; these several crimes proscribed under this Section are not mutually exclusive but they are not included offenses one of the other; the Government should have been required to plead as to each count of the indictment herein which of the crimes it relies upon in charging the offense against this Petitioner.

It is for this particularity of charge that Petitioner herein contends.

This Petitioner contends for certainty and definiteness of

pleading both as to the "scheme" etc., and the mailing or other act in interstate commerce.

Obviously, Rules 8, 13, and 14, should be carefully construed together as they are closely inter-related, but their application in inter-relationship does not supercede the application of Rule 7, and the gist of the entire application is:

Is the defendant fairly charged that he may be fairly tried to the end of being fairly convicted or fairly to stand acquit, without jeopardy? This test Petitioner contends the United States of America herein fully wholly fails!

On these challenges to form and sufficiency of the indictment the Court of Appeals herein contributes: "Outline is similar to the one discussed in *United States v. Birrell* (S. D. N. Y., 1967) 226 F. Supp. 539. (See Appendix A, p. 5a).

II.

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FURTHER TRIAL OF PETITIONER UPON ANY OF THE FIRST 38 COUNTS OF THE INDICTMENT IN WHICH COUNT I WAS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE AFTER THE COURT DISMISSED COUNT I BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF QUESTION 5 OF THIS PETITION.

The Government failed to prove Count 1 (and other Counts) of the indictment; the trial court dismissed the same; the trial court erroneously amended the indictment.

The trial court dismissed Count No. 1 of the indictment after full questioning, explanation and disclosure by counsel then in error sent to the jury when it retired to deliberate a court rendered indictment.

U. S. Const., Amend 5;
Ex parte Bain, 1887, 121 U. S. 1, 7 S. Ct. 781, 30 L. Ed. 849;
Stirone v. U.S., 1960, 361 U.S. 212, 80 S. Ct. 270, 4 L. Ed2d 252;
Jeffers v. U.S., C.A. 9th, 1968, 392 F. 2d 749.,

and in error permitted the jury to deliberate and render its verdict, respectively, upon Counts Nos. 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14,

15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 38, each of which Counts incorporated by reference each paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, of Count 1.

Count No. 1 was dismissed by the Court for reason that the Government failed in its proof as to paragraph 4, thereof, but the Court's reason for dismissal of said Count No. 1, did not make of said dismissal any thing less than a dismissal of the Count No. 1.; the Court's dismissal said Count No. 1. became a nullity; Count 1., as to each paragraph 1, 2, and 3, thereof, was incorporated by reference, as a part of the next succeeding thirty seven counts of the indictment; the reiteration of a nullity does not enhance the nullity with charging substance; the repitition of zero continues to be zero; the trial court, therefore, amended the indictment in the form and manner which the Court provided and submitted to the jury on June 26, 1967, as it retired to deliberate.

This the trial count may not do either by formal amendment of the pleading or in the submission of the case to the Jury in a form that amounts to an amendment of the indictment.

Fed. Pract. & Proced., Wright, Vol. 1, ch. 4, § 127, p. 271, 272, et seq., and cases cited thereunder;

U.S. v. Spector, C.A. 7th 1963, 326 F. 2d 345, 346-348.

The trial court sought only to withdraw that portion of the indictment which the evidence did not support from the Jury in the Court's advise to the Jury, but this is not the record; the Court's record by which it speaks, is that the Court dismissed each Counts Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 27, 31, 36, and 37.

The Government may incorporate Counts by reference in a criminal indictment; we neither here nor in the trial court argue against this practice; we are also aware that where counts fail of proof, on dismissal they may as a general rule be acceptibly physically removed from the indictment before the jury; this does not reach our situation; the trial court need not have dismissed Count 1.; the trial court could have dismissed paragraph 4 of Count 1. which

the Government terms the "charging" paragraph; the trial court could have instructed the jury to return a verdict for the defendant on Count 1. for the reason that the Government had failed in its proof as to paragraph 4 thereof; why so tender of the Government? this much concern for AMICK would have acquitted him!

III.

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN OVERRULING PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS AND CHALLENGE TO EACH THE ARRAY OF THE GRAND JURY WHICH RETURNED THE INDICTMENT AND THE ARRAY OF THE PETIT JURY FROM WHICH TO SELECT THE TRIAL JURY, AND IN DENYING AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING THEREON BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF QUESTIONS 6, 7, AND 8, OF THIS PETITION.

It is ironic that the Court of Appeals finds there was no error committed by the trial court in overruling Petitioner's challenge to the array of the indicting grand jury because Petitioner made insufficient showing of reason therefor which showing was denied him by the error of the trial court in denying an evidentiary hearing thereon where a prima facie case therefor was made.

On September 16, 1966, Petitioner filed his fourth motion to dismiss the indictment and objections to the array of the grand jury, incorporating therein K. K. Irving's motion and objections filed September 6, 1966, and affidavit in support thereof, on the ground that the grand jury that indicted AMICK was neither selected nor drawn and summoned so as to be "truly representative of the community" since by the "keyman" system of prominent citizens recommending veniremen, which was the method of selection employed, there was systematic and intentional exclusion of certain economic, social, religious, racial, political, and geographical groups in the community.

In support of the motion Petitioner and other defendants filed 79 affidavits reflecting interviews with "keymen" used by the Clerk of the district and the standards they used

in submitting names of prospective jurors. The District Court overruled this motion without hearing.

These affidavits showed that the "keymen" used personal standards in submitting names of prospective jurors which standards were illegal and which made it impossible to obtain a representative cross section of the district. For example, 16 of the affidavits show that women were excluded; 5 clearly indicate economic discrimination; 5 indicate that potential jurors were excluded because of their religion or lack of it; 2 excluded people because of their politics; 4 excluded negroes, and when asked why negroes were excluded, stated that they did not know any well enough; 1 excluded any one not of his religious or racial group; 4 excluded persons on the basis of their particular occupation.

In spite of these affidavits and without any counter affidavits or evidence, the trial Court summarily overruled Petitioner's motion and objections.

(Petitioner further timely filed his challenge to array of petit jury on May 29, 1967, and again on June 5, 1967, both motions being overruled by the trial court on June 5, 1967.)

The keyman system has been subject of much litigation and concern. The Judicial Conference in 1967, 42 F.R.D. 353 (1967) condemned this system that has "allowed for unintentional as well as intentional discrimination". The landmark case of *Rabinowitz*, 366 F. 2d 34 (5th Cir. 1966), 44-60, incl., condemned the use of "key men" as a method of selecting jurors though not holding the system illegal per se. As a result trial courts, almost without exception, granted hearings to scrutinize the selection of grand jurors and petit jurors where the question was raised. (See Appendix B, p. 35a. Congress has now abolished the use of the key man system by the Jury Selection Act of 1968 amending 28 U.S.C. 1861 et seq. We do not argue any retroactive application of this statutory amendment; however, the statute does not repeal the law of *Rabinowitz vs. United States*, supra; the 1968 Congressional enactment confirms Rabinowitz and declares its judicial construction and interpretation of the applicable law to be the policy of the statutory law by legislative enactment.

The grand jury system is a critical element in criminal judicial process and its fair administration is essential to achieve a workable system of criminal justice. Thus, it is incumbent upon District Courts to carefully analyze their selection process to insure that such a system complies with the requirements established by law.

These affidavits filed by Petitioner et alia were sufficient to show a prima facie case which required an answer by the Government. A prima facie case has been defined as:

> "A litigating party is said to have a prima facie case when the evidence in his favor is sufficiently strong for his opponent to be called on to answer it. A prima facie case, then, is one which is established by sufficient evidence, and can be overthrown only by rebutting evidence adduced on the other side. In some cases the only question to be considered is whether there is a prima facie case or not. Thus a grand jury are bound to find a true bill of indictment, if the evidence before them creates a prima facie case against the accused; and for this purpose, therefore, it is not necessary for them to hear the evidence for the defense. Mozely & Whitley, And see State v. Hardelein, 169 Mo. 579, 70 S.W. 130; State v. Lawlor, 28 Minn. 216, 9 N.W. 698."
>
> *Black's Law Dictionary,* 4th Ed., p. 1353.

In the instant case, the Government made no factual response. The Supreme Court recently, in *Whitus v. Georgia,* (1967), 385 U.S. 545, 550, 17 L.Ed. 2d 599, 604 stated:

> "However, once a prima facie case is made out the burden shifts to the prosecution."

In the instant case, the highly subjective approach and illegal standards used by the majority of the key men is at war with principles insisting upon a jury composed of a fair cross section of the community. *Witcher v. Payton,* 405 F.2d 725 (4th Cir., 1969).

The hearing requested by Petitioner would have given him the opportunity to conduct discovery and subpoena wit-

nesses. No investigation of any kind had been instituted in the Southern District of Indiana to examine the selection of jurors prior to Petitioner's motion. This sharply contrasts with reported decisions which indicate zealousness to conduct such hearings, e.g., *United States v. Leonette*, 291 F. Supp. 461, 463 (S.D. N.Y. 1968). A system that at the time of Petitioner's motion had been condemned from all quarters should minimally have been carefully scrutinized rather than summarily sanctioned. The Court of Appeals posed of this question in affirming the trial court by referring to Judge Steckler's opinion in *United States v. Duke*, 263 F. Supp. 828 (S.D. Ind. 1967). The Government, in its brief to Court of Appeals, referred to the fact that the 79 affidavits taken by counsel for defendants were considered in the *Duke* case. This reference is correct to the extent therein stated but what really happened is that counsel for defendants talked with 79 key men, secured their affidavits and prepared for an evidentiary hearing. Subsequent to the filing of Petitioner's motion, the motion in *Duke* was filed and the affidavits were copies by the attorney representing *Duke* and presented to Judge Steckler. Counsel, in *Duke*, then presented his argument and counsel who had gathered all the facts was precluded from participation. By this method, the Government obtained a stamp of approval on the key man jury selection method as it purportedly existed in the District or Division without Petitioner or his counsel or any other defendants or their respective counsel participating.

The conclusion of the Government, the trial court, and the Court of Appeals that the key man system was not invalid per se does not answer Petitioner's contention for it was not incumbent upon Petitioner to assume this additional burden of proof and he did not; it does become apparent, however, that contending for the skeleton of validity while nurturing the flesh of invalidity is an empty gesture and spurious reasoning; this court holds really that the jury selection system employed in the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division in the indictment of Petitioner and other defendants, while tainted, was not sufficiently tainted to be contaminated; Mr. Churchill expressed an

analogy descriptive of the welfare state which is appropos such reasoning; the Government, the trial court and the Court of Appeals argue a criteria of degree of departure or lack of it from constitutional standards, the tests of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 amending 28 U.S.C. § 1861, and the *Rabinowitz* holding; such approach is not correct judicial construction; "the Civil Rights Act of 1957 amended 28 U.S.C. §1861 so as to leave very definite tests of character and intelligence to render one incompetent to serve as a juror in federal court; namely, conviction of felony and inability to read, write, speak and understand the English language."

> *Rabinowitz v. United States*, 366 F.2d 34, 51, 54 (5th Cir. 1966).

Neither the Civil Rights Act of 1967 nor *Rabinowitz*, individually or collectively, are entitled to be read as a BLACK MAGNA CARTA not applicable to areas of jury exclusion other than for race or color; the criteria of each the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the *Rabinowitz* decision encompass all of the members of the community.

The Congress in enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1957 "intended to confer an additional civil right, i.e., the right to be a federal juror."

> *Rabinowitz v. United States*, 366 F.2d 34, 54 (5th Cir. 1966).

IV.

THE EVIDENCE WAS NOT SUFFICIENT TO CONVICT PETITIONER TO THAT DEGREE OF PROOF REQUIRED BY LAW BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF QUESTION 9 OF THIS PETITION.

As to Count No. 6, the evidence was Schmidt responded to an ASU ad in Marion Chronicle and bought 100 shares of ASU stock from defendant, Eddie Oakerson, which stock certificate he received through the mail from defendant, G. N. Van Horn & Associates, Inc.

As to this Count only Petitioner was found guilty of all the defendants charged; there were no pleas of nolo con-

tendere to this Court; the Jury then WITHOUT ANY EVIDENCE THEREON, in error found Petitioner either "schemed" with himself or did the mailing with the requisite intent.

As to Count No. 10, Willie R. Henry answered ASU ad in Indiana Investor and Business News of June 26, 1964, and mailed $1200.00 check payable to ASU dated July 2, 1964, ordering ASU stock therefor.

As to Count No. 12, ASU Letter signed K. K. Irving, President, dated August 14, 1964, enclosing Canadian licensing agreement release of August 12, 1964, announcing ASU Board of Directors withdraws stock offer as of August 19, 1964, midnite, was received through mail by Benjamin F. Callan; it is the mailing of the August 14, 1964 letter with press release which is the charge here; Ben Callan later bought $2400.00, 400 shares of ASU stock from Mr. Warren Krill; Court erroneously overruled Petitioner's objection to conversation and to argument by Government before Jury, the Government stating:

> "Your Honor, Mr. Krill is alleged as a coschemer and co-conspirator. This morning we read the letter from co-defendant Fred G. Amick to Mr. Krill paying him his commission for the sale of stock."

which letter from Amick to Krill was dated July 8, 1964, more than a month before the August Transaction of Callan with Krill and concerns payment of "commission on the $12,000.00 stock sale".

As to Count No. 13, Maise Jean Riggin, ASU stock transfer clerk says confirmation for 400 ASU shares of stock to Roy C. Lehman "would have been sent by mail to Mr. Lehman" from ASU and Lehman says received through mail.

As to this Count only Petitioner was found guilty of all the defendants charged; there were no pleas of nolo contendere to this Count; the Jury then WITHOUT ANY EVIDENCE THEREON in error found Petitioner either "schemed" with himself or did the mailing with the requisite intent.

As to Count No. 14, Julian Longoria received confirmation for 100 shares ASU common stock dated August 28, 1964, through mail at Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. Longoria had no

contact with any one connected with ASU other than meeting Mr. Capper once some time after Mr. Longoria's friend, Mr. Jones, had suggested Longoria buy ASU stock.

As to Count No. 15, the charge is the mailing of a confirmation for 101 shares of ASU common stock from Commercial Capital Corporation to Robert K. Riley and G. L. Riley; THERE IS NO EVIDENCE ON THIS! Government's Exhibits 179, 180, 181, document the 5000 ASU stock share contract purchase with CCC of February 23, 1965 which Riley did not pay; Government's Exhibit 199 is a stock warrant to the Rileys for 50 shares of ASU stock.

As to Count No. 18, James O. Perkins testified he mailed his check in the amount of $1950.00 for purchase of ASU stock to Commercial Capital Corporation, confirmed by Barnitz, SEC accountant.

As to Count No. 20, exact copy of Government's Exhibit 95 came to Ethel J. Huffman by mail; Government's Exhibit 95 is an ASU letter signed by K. K. Irving dated October 19, 1964, containing statements predicting monthly productions by ASM of 300 aircraft and announcing $7,500,000.00 Canadian interest in ASM.

THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT A STOCK WARRANT CAME WITH THIS LETTER THROUGH THE MAIL!

The charge is: "Matter Mailed dated October 19, 1964 with stock warrant."

There was no misrepresentation by Amick, Irving, Van Horn or anyone from ASU but a full disclosure in the Federal Court in Tampa, Florida; there was a termination of all transactions with Streets and Umbaugh and neither Streets nor Umbaugh had any claims on ASU, Irving or Amick not settled by the Federal Court in Tampa, Florida.

The sale of ASU treasury stock interstate was made on erroneous advise, without criminal intent, was stopped immediately the error became known and the SEC was advised.

Fred G. Amick did not sell any ASU stock.

Van Horn was the only knowledgeable person in sale of stocks, raising capital by public subscription, and the like;

Amick and Irving were completely unsophisticated in such matters as they were in aircraft manufacture; Amick did not trust Van Horn and exerted his influence to rid the operation of Van Horn, Van Horn & Associates, and Commercial Capital Corporation as readily as he could make this influence felt; Van Horn plead nolo contendere and then testified as a government witness; he implicates AMICK but barely and then not as a wilful participant in any of the allegedly criminal acts complained of; it should also be noted that AMICK was not chairman of the board of directors of either of the A & S companies during the times complained of by the Government; it was only when AMICK tried to save the Companies after the Chappell interests had caused the Companies to fail that AMICK was the guiding force of the Companies, president of the same and chairman of the board; when Chappell interests acquired A & S companies in January 1965, air and space stock was being traded and their stockholders were not damaged appreciably if at all; no A & S stock was sold publicly during the Chappell tenure but the Chappell operation ruined Air & Space prospects though AMICK later personally bought back in and desperately tried to produce aircraft and save the companies; some 64 aircraft were sold to dealers or distributors; the defendants representing the Chappell interests were granted severance on trial and were later tried and acquitted in a more favorable climate than AMICK and others were tried and after the hue and cry of the news media had ceased.

The violation of this Petitioner's constitutional rights and his rights under the statutory law as construed and interpreted by judicial decision have been violated as stated herein and can only now be remedied by this Court granting certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit as Petitioner herein prays.

Respectfully submitted

VANCE M. WAGGONER,
130 East Second Street
Rushville, Indiana, 46173

Counsel for Petitioner

APPENDIX A

in the

United States Court of Appeals

for the Seventh Circuit

SEPTEMBER TERM, 1969 — JANUARY SESSION 1970

Nos. 17084-087, 17089-095
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
FRED G. AMICK, et al.,
Defendants-Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana.

JANUARY 22, 1971

Before FAIRCHILD, CUMMINGS and KERNER, *Circuit Judges.*

FAIRCHILD, *Circuit Judge.* These are appeals by eleven individuals and two corporations from judgments of conviction of violations of 15 U.S.C. §77q (Section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933, Fraudulent interstate transactions). Eight of the individual appellants and the corporations were convicted by a jury.[1] The other three individual appellants were convicted upon pleas of nolo contendere. Others were named in the indictment, but entered pleas or had separate trials, and are not involved on these appeals.

The charges arose out of sales of the common stock of Air & Space Underwriters, Inc. (ASU). ASU was newly formed and contemplated a business (through a subsidiary) of

[1]Another corporation, convicted by the jury, has not appealed.

manufacturing and selling gyroplanes. A gyroplane is similar to a helicopter in that each has a rotor wing. The gyroplane's rotor, when in flight, is free wheeling and not powered. Forward motion is generated by a propeller. A helicopter's rotor, on the other hand, is powered in flight and has forward motion as a result. ASU took over the development of the gyroplane from Umbaugh Aircraft Corporation pursuant to a plan of reorganization of that company, approved in a Chapter X proceeding by a federal district court in Florida. There is evidence that the gyroplane to be produced could land and take off without a runway, and could carry a passenger in addition to the pilot. It was hoped that it could be produced at a price which would make it feasible for various types of business and personal transportation uses.

ASU stock was sold to investors in Indiana from August 14, 1963 until July, 1965 when the SEC obtained an injunction. The prices paid by investors during this period aggregated $2.1 million. 15 gyroplanes were produced and sold.

It appears, virtually beyond dispute, that during this period the effort to promote sales of ASU stock included general releases and individual communications which contained untrue statements of material facts, omitted material facts necessary to make the statements made not misleading, and included devices to defraud and practices which would operate as a fraud upon the purchaser. The areas of misrepresentation included the price at which the plane could be sold, progress toward production, orders on hand, and the financial history and condition of ASU. The details will not be stated except as required in discussion of particular counts. There was abundant evidence of pattern of conduct, plan, and design from which a jury could find that the false and misleading assertions, to the investing public by way of the media, including the Indiana Investor in particular, and to prospective purchasers by sales literature and individual sales efforts, constituted a scheme to defraud, changing in content from time to time. The ultimate question is whether the appellants were properly found criminally responsible for wilfully having employed such scheme or wilfully having obtained money by means of such misrepresentations.

Appellants challenge the indictment on several grounds, and make other attacks on procedure. Those who stood trial argue that the evidence was insufficient to support the respective guilty verdicts.

1. *The challenge to the array of the grand jury.* All appellants contend that the grand jury which indicted them was unlawfully selected. Appellants who stood trial assert the same defect with respect to the petit jury. The challenge is made to an early step in the system by which most names were selected for the jury list from which the names of veniremen were drawn. Documents were placed before the district court in support of and opposition to the challenge. Most of them were the same as those described and considered by Chief Judge Steckler of the same court in overruling a similar challenge at about the same time.[2]

Appellants rely principally on statements appearing in *Rabinowitz v. United States*[3] although there was no showing in the instant case suggesting the virtual exclusion or gross under-representation on the jury list of any group or class of residents of the district or division.

The names of prospective grand jurors were drawn from among 1,200 names, at least 300 being on the jury list in each of four divisions. The names of prospective petit jurors were drawn from the 300 on the list in the Indianapolis division. The division lists were maintained at 300 by addition from time to time of names of persons who had answered questionnaires and been found qualified and not exempt. Most of the names of the larger number to whom the questionnaires had been sent were supplied by so-called key men who were asked by the clerk and jury commissioner to supply them.

As needed, the clerk and jury commissioner sent a form letter to key men in the counties in the district. According to an affidavit by the clerk, the key men were persons "who were thought to be widely acquainted with persons of diverse

---

[2]United States v. Duke (S.D. Ind., 1967) 263 FSupp. 828.

[3](5th Cir., 1966), 366 F2d 34. In a later decision, Mobley v. United States (1967), 379 F2d 768, 773, the fifth circuit stated that in Rabinowitz "we did not thus declare the 'key man' selection system illegal as such."

backgrounds within their own communities, and were most likely to suggest jurors representing a fair cross section of such communities."

The form letter soliciting suggestions was before the court. It stated in part that jurors must be "capable and impartial and . . . selected without regard to race, color, creed, politics or station of life." The recipient was asked "to suggest the names of men and women in your community who, in your judgment, would make qualified jurors." A sheet setting forth 28 U.S.C. §§1861 and 1862, listing qualifications and exemptions, was enclosed and it was said, "In making your suggestions please refer to the statutory requirements set forth on the attached sheet." Apparently about 140 key men had responded to such letters in the course of three years.

In November, 1966 several individuals interviewed 79 key men concerning the type of persons whose names each had suggested and prepared affidavits summarizing the interviews. These affidavits were before Judge Dillin as they had been before Judge Steckler. It seems fair to say in summary that most or all the key men said they had some standard in mind as to who would make a "responsible" juror. Indeed, any form of key man system of suggestion would almost necessarily involve the application of some subjective standard of that type. We do not consider, however, that either constitutional concepts or any statutes applicable in 1966 or 1967 compelled a purely random selection from the whole body of qualified persons in the community.[4]

It appears from the affidavits that several key men acknowledged that they had not suggested names of persons belonging to particular groups or classes. Some of the reasons, *e.g.*, that jury duty would be a hardship on poorly paid workers, that men make better jurors than women, and that young adults are too immature, would tend to establish invalidity if such reason were found to have guided most or a substantial group of key men, but we deem the degree to

---

[4]The indictment and trial preceded enactment of the Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968, 28 U.S.C. §§1861-1871, requiring a system of random selection from among those who vote or register to vote.

which these reasons operated among the total number interviewed was clearly insubstantial.

The district court, in overruling the challenge, concluded that the key man system was not invalid per se, and that the affidavits neither established exclusion of classes of qualified persons nor made a showing sufficient to require further inquiry. We agree.

2. *Challenges to form and sufficiency of indictment.* The first 38 counts of the indictment charged varying groups of defendants with violations of 15 U.S.C. §77q(a). The outline is similar to the one discussed in *United States v. Birrell.*[5] Count 39 charged appellants Vollmer and Indiana Investor and Business News, Inc. (Indiana Investor) and others with violation of 15 U.S.C. §77q(b) in publicizing ASU stock. Count 40 charged several defendants with violation of 15 U.S.C. 77e(a) (2) by mailing ASU stock without a registration statement being in effect. Count 41 charged all defendants with conspiring to commit the offenses charged in the other counts.

A number of the first 38 counts and count 40 were dismissed on motion of the government or for failure of proof. The jury acquitted various defendants on several counts among the first 38, and acquitted all defendants on count 41. The jury convicted Vollmer and Indiana Investor on count 39 and convicted one or more appellants on each of the remaining first 38 counts.

Each of the first 38 counts charged that several defendants, by the use of the mails in the offer and sale of ASU stock to a particular purchaser, wilfully (1) employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud, (2) obtained money and property by means of untrue statements of material facts and omissions to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, and (3) engaged in transactions, practices, and courses of business which would and did operate as a fraud and deceit upon

---

[5](S.D.N.Y., 1967), 226 FSupp. 539.

purchasers, including the purchaser named in the particular count. In each count, also, the date, addressee, and content of a mailed communication were alleged.

Each of the 38 counts contained a detailed description of of the manner in which all defendants allegedy accomplished (1), (2), and (3) above referred to with respect to all purchasers of ASU stock, generally. The largest part of the description set forth the history of ASU, its acquisition of the Umbaugh company, the transactions by which particular defendants became interested as stockholders, directors, officers, or underwriters of ASU, and the amounts of stock sold during particular periods of time by named groups of defendants. At trial, there seems to have been little if any dispute about the background facts so alleged.

Paragraph 2 of this description set forth fourteen statements of fact which were alleged to be false and to have been willfully made as part of the devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud and of the transactions, practices and courses of business operating as fraud. Paragraph 3 set forth ten statements of fact, alleged to have been omitted, but necessary to make the statements made not misleading. Each list was said not to be exclusive.

The detailed description just referred to alleged a course of conduct from May 15, 1963 to the date of the indictment, appeared as part of count 1, and was incorporated by reference in each of the following 37 counts.

Several attacks are made upon the indictment. We find no merit in them, and point them out briefly, as follows:

Vagueness: The indictment dealt with a subject matter sufficiently complex that care is required in reading it, but it is not vague. In each of the first 38 counts several defendants are charged in the terms of the statute with willfully performing the proscribed acts in the offer and sale of ASU stock to a named purchaser, and the incidental use of the mails is described. As already mentioned, each count contained a general description of the background and a list, though not exclusive, of fraudulent statements and

omissions, alleging conduct continuing generally throughout two years, although the transactions and some of the misrepresentations took place at different times within the two year period. The dates of mailing in all counts fell within that period.

The indictment "contains the elements of the offense intended to be charged, 'and sufficiently apprises the defendant of what he must be prepared to meet, and, in case any other proceedings are taken against him for a similar offense, whether the record shows with accuracy to what extent he may plead a former acquittal or conviction.' "[6]

Incorporation by reference: It happened that count 1, in which the general description of the background and of the fraud was expressly set out, was dismissed for failure of proof. Several appellants contend that dismissal erased the count so that the portion of each other count incorporating part of count 1 by reference incorporated nothing. They claim it follows that without the incorporated part of count 1, all other counts ceased to charge an offense. The latter proposition is not clear but in any event we reject the argument that the counts must be read as if the incorporated material ceased to exist upon dismissal of count 1.

Duplicity: 15 U.S.C. §77q(a) makes it unlawful, in the offer or sale of securities, by the use of the mails, to engage in certain conduct. The proscribed conduct is described as (1), (2) *or* (3).[7] Each count of the first 38 charges that defendants engaged in (1), (2), *and* (3). It is argued that each count charges three distinct offenses.

---

[6]Haynes v. United States (1932), 285 U.S. 427, 431.

[7]"77q. Fraudulent interstate transactions.

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person in the offer or sale of any securities by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by the use of the mails, directly or indirectly —

"(1) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud, or

"(2) to obtain money or property by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, or

"(3) to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser."

An answer was suggested by *Crain v. United States*.[8] There the "statute was directed against certain defined modes for accomplishing a general object, and declaring that the doing of either one of several specified things, each having reference to that object, should be punished. . . . We perceive no sound reason why the doing of the prohibited thing, in each and all of the prohibited modes, may not be charged in one count, so that there may be a verdict of guilty upon proof that the accused had done any one of the things constituting a substantive crime under the statute."

The *Crain* rationale has, correctly, we think, been applied to the offenses now under consideration:

> "The statute thus embraces in the disjunctive three separate and distinct acts as a crime. The indictment charges the three offenses in the language of the statute, but they are charged in the conjunctive. An indictment charging a statutory offense must follow the statute creating it; but where the statute denounces several acts as a crime, they may be charged in one indictment or in a single count if they are connected in the conjunctive. An indictment drawn in that manner is not duplicitous, and it suffices to prove any one or more of the charges. [citing cases.]"[9]

Multiplicity: Appellants argue that the allowable unit of prosecution is participation in the allegedly fraudulent course of conduct, and that any particular use of the mails in connection with any particular sale is only a jurisdictional fact upon the basis of which participation in the overall course of conduct can be federally prosecuted; that the first 38 counts allege no more than one offense.

Courts have differed as to "the allowable unit of prosecution"[10] under this statute.

There is authority for the view (1) that, as is true of mail fraud, each separate use of the mails in the execution of a

---

[8](1896), 162 U.S. 625, 636.

[9]Troutman v. United States (10th Cir., 1938), 100 F2d 628, 631-2.

[10]United States v. Universal C.I.T. Credit Corp. (1952), 344 U.S. 218, 221.

scheme to defraud in the sale of securities constitutes a separate offense;[11] (2) that each separate offer or sale transaction in which the proscribed conduct is employed and the mails used is the allowable unit;[12] (3) that where an indictment charges employment of proscribed conduct in separate transactions as separate counts, the determination whether there was one offense with several victims or a separate offense upon each victim can ordinarily not be made until proof is in;[13] (4) that where an indictment alleges a scheme to defraud and a number of separate mailings and sales in separate counts, but fails to show that the crime charged in any one count differs from that charged in the others, all counts are to be consolidated and all but one dismissed as separate counts.[14]

The counts in this indictment charged not only separate mailings, but separate sales, so that neither (1) nor (2) would require dismissal of any count. Under (3) dismissal before trial would be inappropriate, and the question need be considered only with respect to cumulative penalties on several counts. We consider (3) a sounder view than (4).[15] We hold that the district court properly refused to dismiss or consolidate counts before trial, and shall give further consideration to the matter when we reach the claim that consecutive sentences were inappropriate.

3. Joinder. Various appellants contend that offenses and defendants were improperly joined, and that in any event discretionary severance should have been granted.

Rule 8(a) F.R.Cr.P. allows joinder of two or more offenses in separate counts in one indictment "if the offenses

---

[11]Palmer v. United States (10th Cir., 1956), 339 F2d 861, 867, cert. den. 350 U.S. 996.

[12]Sanders v. United States (5th Cir., 1969), 415 F2d 621, 626; United States v. Saporta (E.D.N.Y., 1967), 270 FSupp. 183, 186. In this circuit it has been said that "the government must show some impact of the scheme on the investor and that the mails were used in those instances where the impact occurred." United States v. Schaefer (7th Cir., 1962), 299 F2d 625, 629.

[13]United States v. Birrell (S.D.N.Y., 1967), 266 FSupp. 539, 544.

[14]United States v. Hughes (S.D.N.Y., 1961), 195 FSupp. 795, 798.

[15]Cf. United States v. Universal C.I.T. Credit Corp. (1952), 344 U.S. 218, 224. United States v. Ketchum (2d Cir., 1963), 320 F2d 3, 7.

charged . . . are of the same or similar character or are based on . . . two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan." There can be no question of the propriety of joining the first 38 counts in one indictment. Count 39 charged wilfully, by use of the mails, giving publicity to and describing ASU stock for a consideration received from an issuer, underwriter, and dealer without fully disclosing the receipt and amount of the consideration. Count 40 (later dismissed) charged wilfully causing ASU stock, an unregistered security, to be carried through the mails for sale and delivery. Count 41 (upon which all appellants were acquitted) charged a conspiracy to commit the other offenses. All the substantive offenses were violations of the securities act, involved the same security, and were alleged to have occurred during the duration of the alleged conspiracy. We have no doubt that at the least the acts and transactions upon which all 41 counts were based were "connected together or constituting part of a common scheme or plan." Joinder of the offenses was authorized by the rule.

Rule 8(b) permits joinder of two or more defendants if they are alleged to have participated in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. All defendants need not be charged in each count. We think the acts and transactions *alleged in the first 38* counts, and in counts 39, 40, and 41 may be deemed one series of acts or transactions for the purpose of this rule.

Several appellants contend that they were prejudiced by joint trial and that the district court abused its discretion in denying motions for severance under Rule 14. F.R.Cr.P.

We do not find it so. It is true that the proof was voluminous (4,000 pages of transcript, covering four weeks of trial, and more than 1,000 exhibits, at least marked for identification). Several appellants were securities salesmen, while others occupied positions of greater responsibility and authority. Several appellants were active in sales of ASU stock during periods when other appellants were not. On the other hand, there was also considerable over-

lapping in time. The proof was orderly and as chronological as reasonably possible, and the court gave frequent cautionary instructions. As will be seen when sufficiency of the evidence is discussed, the jury was capable of discernment among counts and among defendants.

We consider the trial fundamentally fair.

During the investigation by the SEC various defendants had given testimony pursuant to administrative subpoenas. Transcripts were received by the court, but were not put before the jury except as excerpts were read. In each case the court instructed the jury that the excerpt was to be considered only against the defendant who made the statement.

Appellant Broderick contends that he was denied the right of confrontation and cross-examination[16] by such reading. He fails to specify the portions of statements of his codefendants which incriminated him. His name was apparently mentioned only in the portion read from appellant Olsen's SEC testimony. Olsen did not testify. These references established Mr. Broderick's presence at several conversations or occasions only generally described, and if they could be deemed incriminating in any sense, they were merely cumulative and the error, if any, harmless beyond a reasonable doubt.

These excerpts were not highly incriminating with respect to the person testifying except as they laid a foundation for an inference that the person knew the state of affairs was different from that which was represented to purchasers. In instructing the jury that these excerpts must be weighed with caution and the circumstances scrutinized to determine whether they were made voluntarily, the court referred to them several times as "statements" and once as "alleged admissions". Several appellants contend that the latter characterization was prejudicial. We do not find it so.

4. Pretrial publicity and voir dire. Certain appellants

[16]Bruton v. United States (1968), 391 U.S. 123.

contend that prejudicial pretrial publicity required the court to dismiss the indictment or postpone the trial. There had been news stories concerning the indictment, about a year before trial. Two days before trial there had been two news stories. One referred to a "stock swindler" and concerned an unrelated indictment. Another reported the nolo contendere pleas of two of appellants' codefendants, and referred to the "gyroplane swindle". Appellants were not named.

The district judge conducted a careful and extensive voir dire. 64 prospective jurors were questioned. Although 40 said they had read or heard something in the media about the case, only two said they had formed opinions which would require evidence to overcome. They were excused. Most of the other 38 could not recall the extent of what they had read or heard and none had formed any opinion. Some recalled very recent news reports stating that the trial was to begin. There was nothing to indicate these had any prejudicial content. 9 of the 38 were selected for the jury. The answers indicated the content of the news stories had made little impression.

Denial of continuance was not an abuse of discretion, and we see no reason to believe the publicity affected the fairness of the trial.

The district judge questioned the prospective jurors, but invited defense counsel to request additional questions, which the judge then asked. Although objections to this method are urged by some of the appellants, it is authorized by Rule 24(a) F.R.Cr.P.[17]

5. *Claim of mistrial because of approach to juror.* Just before the beginning of the trial, Mr. Morrow, a juror who ultimately became foreman, reported an incident to the district judge. A Mr. Rank, a business associate of Morrow, who was president of a bank, had told Morrow of a call Rank received from appellant Vollmer after selection of the jury. According to Rank, Vollmer had once attempted unsuccess-

[17]See cases cited in Hamer v. United States (9th Cir., 1958), 259 F2d 274, 279.

fully to arrange a mortgage for some property that Rank was interested in. Mr. Vollmer asked Rank if Rank thought that Morrow remembered Vollmer and if Morrow's decision as juror would be influenced in any way because Vollmer was unsuccessful in arranging for the mortgage. Morrow told the judge he did not remember Vollmer and had no recollection of the transaction. He said he had not told any other juror of the call and promised not to do so.

The court and counsel discussed the situation. Defense counsel moved for a mistrial, but the court decided to proceed.

Judge Dillin informed the jury substantially as follows: "One of the parties . . . contacted an acquaintance and asked him a question which required the acquaintance to ask a member of the jury for the answer, thus, of course, bringing to the attention of the juror the party who asked the question in the first place. The juror very properly related this to the Clerk, who related it to me, and I have now made it known to the attorneys . . . I think, on thorough reflection, that nothing improper was intended, although, as I say, it was an irregularity on the part of the person who did it . . . I am sure nothing out of the way will happen in the future, but if anything does, please report it promptly."

It is suggested that juror Morrow probably became prejudiced against Vollmer by Vollmer's call and that the other jurors probably became prejudiced against all appellants on trial as a result of being told that an unnamed party had indirectly contacted an unnamed juror. We think the incident is not of sufficient import reasonably to lead to those conclusions.

6. *Sufficiency of the evidence.* The first 38 counts rested upon separate sales and mailings. The mailings were made on dates from October 14, 1963 to June 1, 1965.

The first public offering of ASU stock began August 14, 1963 and was formally terminated June 1, 1964. The price was $4 per share.

The second public offering, at $6 per share began in June, 1964.

An offer at $5 per share was made to existing stockholders October 19, 1964.

The stock was split in December, 1964. Control of ASU changed from appellants Irving and Amick and their associates in January, 1965 to Chappell and his associates. In March, 1965 the SEC began its investigation and in July, 1965, it obtained an injunction against fraudulent sales.

Count 41 charged 23 individual and 6 corporate defendants, including appellants, with conspiring among themselves and with others named. The conspiracy allegedly continued from May 15, 1963 to the date of the indictment in 1966. Concededly many of the defendants did not participate in sales of ASU stock throughout the period, but it was the theory of the government that each was a member of the conspiracy during the period he was involved in the sales effort. The jury, however, acquitted of conspiracy all who stood trial.

We have already referred to the material incorporated in each of the 38 counts, alleging that from May 15, 1963 on, all appellants and others engaged in the conduct proscribed by 15 U.S.C. 77q(a), (1), (2), and (3) in the manner described in detail. Government counsel evidently considered, in drawing the indictment, that each defendant was responsibly associated in the fraudulent conduct throughout that defendants' participation in sales of stock. Again, however, the jury rejected reliance on any assumption of that nature and seems cautiously to have considered each count submitted, one by one.

a. *The case as to Amick.* Mr. Amick and Mr. K. K. Irving had held a dealership under Umbaugh. They were moving forces in the organization of ASU May 15, 1963 and the take-over from Umbaugh, under a plan of reorganization. Amick was secretary-treasurer of ASU and chairman of the board. He was active in management and in the planning and arrangement of the various offerings

of stock. The jury could well have found that the successive offering prices and the stock split were a means of giving a false impression of increasing value. He must surely have known the material facts and responsibly have known of the misrepresentation and omissions in the sales material and the promotional news releases. He resigned as an officer in January, 1965, and as a director shortly thereafter.

Amick was charged in each of the first 38 counts, 26 of them were submitted to the jury. His active central role makes it seem likely that conviction on all counts, at least those which arose before his resignation, might have been sustained. The jury convicted, however, on 8 counts and acquitted on the rest. Chronologically, the dates of the mailings in 6 of the counts on which he was convicted ran from March 4, 1964 to September 1, 1964. The dates of mailing in the two other counts were October 14 and 21, 1964. Amick did not deal in person with these purchasers. But the jury could clearly find that the forbidden fraudulent practices were employed in these sales and that Amick was wilfully responsible for their employment.

Amick was sentenced to four years imprisonment on count 6 (March 4, 1964) and two years on each other count. The two year terms are concurrent with each other, but consecutive to the four year term. The content of the fraud did not remain static. Disclosures concerning some of the adverse history of Umbaugh were omitted from the prospectus for the second offering, although included in the first. The expectation of benefits from an agreement with a Canadian group in August 1964 were grossly overstated. Deceptive photographs were sent to stockholders just before the October, 1964 offer in order to create the impression that regular production had begun. There were other additional misrepresentations from time to time. As previously stated, there are decisions holding that each mailing or each sale is a distinct offense, and it would logically follow that cumulative penalties could be imposed. Even under a different view, however, we think that the scheme to defraud involved in the various counts was

sufficiently different as time went on, and that Amick was sufficiently active in formulating and augmenting the scheme that the use of the scheme in each of the respective counts could fairly be deemed a distinct offense with cumulative penalties, at least to the extent imposed here.

b. *The case as to Broderick.* Broderick was employed as a salesman for Van Horn Associates, dealer or underwriter for the first public offering. In June, 1964, he was employed by ASU as "stock control manager". He revised the prospectus, omitting material facts, and stating untruths with respect to patents and production, and used it in a number of sales.

Broderick was charged in the first 17 counts, the dates of mailing running from October 14, 1963 to September 29, 1964. 10 counts were submitted to the jury. He was convicted on count 17, and acquitted on the others.

Count 17 involved a sale of stock to Rufus S. Gray, and mailing the certificate to him.

Mr. Gray testified that about August 20, 1964, two men called at his office, McQuinn and Broderick. Both discussed ASU stock. He was given the prospectus which Broderick had revised. Gray was unable to say which man made particular statements, but one or the other represented that the company had over a million dollars in backlog orders, which was false, and that the price of the plane would be around $13,900, a matter which was still highly speculative, and that the plane could be flown with three or four hours instruction. The jury could well say that the scheme was employed in the sale.

Whatever the reason the jury acquitted Broderick of other counts, we think it could properly find him guilty on this count. The jury could properly find him responsible for statements even if made by McQuinn since they were made in Broderick's presence and in a joint effort to sell the stock. Broderick's position with ASU was sufficiently responsible to make him chargeable with knowledge of the facts. Wilfullness could be inferred.

c. *The case as to Vollmer and Indiana Investor.* Mr.

Vollmer was editor of the Indiana Investor and Business News, published weekly by defendant corporation of similar name. Indiana Investor was devoted to "News of Indiana Business, Industry, and Securities". The record shows that it was frequently a channel by which misleading information concerning ASU stock reached investors and several purchasers testified that their interest in ASU stock had been generated by reading Indiana Investor. The government contends that almost from the beginning of the fraudulent promotion of ASU stock Vollmer frequently visited the company's facilities and was aware of facts in the light of which the news stories and some of his own editorial comments in Indiana Investor were false or misleading. There is evidence to support this contention.

Vollmer and the publishing corporation were charged in 36 of the first 38 counts, with mailing dates ranging from February 19, 1964 to June 1, 1965. 26 of these counts were submitted to the jury. It convicted Vollmer and the corporation on count 26, and acquitted them on all others. They were also charged and convicted on count 39, a violation of 15 U.S.C. §77q(b).

Count 26 involved a purchaser named Janie Stech, and a mailing to her on January 21, 1965 of a confirmation for 1,000 shares at $6 per share. The sale was made by defendant Dowling, an employee of defendants Mayne and Securities Services, also convicted on that count.

Mrs. Stech testified that she had first become interested in ASU stock as a result of reading in Indiana Investor about the planned stock split. She had then bought 200 shares from Dowling in December, 1964. While considering the purchase of the 1,000 shares solicited by Dowling in January, she went to see Vollmer and asked him about Dowling and the plane. Vollmer spoke favorably of both, but told her he knew where she could get stock for $4 instead of $6. She considered herself committed to Dowling, however, and bought from him. Later another dealer telephoned her and offered stock for $4.

It must be acknowledged that Mr. Vollmer made no identi-

fiable affirmative misrepresentation in the conversation about which Mrs. Stech testified. We think, however, that the evidence tending to show that he knowingly published false or misleading reports and editorial comment concerning ASU, was sufficient, in the light of the circumstances, to find him a wilfull and knowing participant in the fraudulent course of conduct which generated the sales to Mrs. Stech, and, indeed, others.

At about the time of the Stech purchase of 1,000 shares, Vollmer persuaded Van Horn, the president of Commercial Capital, an interested dealer, to send a letter to all Commercial Capital and ASU stockholders recommending that they subscribe to Vollmer's paper. Vollmer prepared the letter, saying that Commercial Capital and ASU planned to use Indiana Investor to keep the Indiana investment community informed on the progress of ASU. The letter was mailed January 25. Very possibly the jury selected this particular count because of the personal appeal of Mrs. Stech to Vollmer for advice and the opportunity that gave him to give her information she needed and because of the proximity in time to the letter of January 25 and the events dealt with in count 39.

Count 39 charged Vollmer and Indiana Investor, and two others not on trial, with wilful violation of 15 U.S.C. §77q(b). The gist of the charge was that they "by the use of the mails, published and . . . circulated . . . newspaper articles . . . which, though not purporting to offer a security for sale, described such security . . . for a consideration received, directly and indirectly, from an issuer, underwriter and dealer without fully disclosing the receipt of such consideration and the amount thereof". The Indiana Investor of January 29, 1965 was alleged to have been mailed on that date.

The January 29 issue reported acquisition of control of ASU by Robert Chappell's company, Investment Corporation of America (ICA) and an investment of "over $2 million", accomplished in major part by the purhase of a block of authorized, but unissued stock. This was itself untrue or, at least, misleading. But the point under count 39 was that

Chappell and Vollmer had discussed the preparation and publication of the story, and at Vollmer's suggestion, Chappell had agreed to buy subscriptions for all stockholders of ICA. The testimony was that this would cost $1,000 or $1,200. On February 1, however, Chappell gave Vollmer an ICA check for $2,500. The January 29 issue of Indiana Investor did not disclose that consideration would be received.

We think the jury could properly find that Vollmer published the article in return for the promise of payment.

Vollmer and Indiana Investor contend that 15 U.S.C. §77q(b), here found to have been violated, abridges freedom of the press, contrary to the first amendment.

The purpose of the statute is clear, and was stated in a committee report at the time of passage of the act as follows:

Section 17(b) "is particularly designed to meet the evils of the 'tipster sheet' as well as articles in newspaper or periodicals that purport to give an unbiased opinion but which opinions in reality are bought and paid for."[18]

The substantial interest of the investing public in knowing whether an apparently objective statement in the press concerning a security is motivated by promise of payment is obvious. We see no significant abridgement of freedom of the press in requiring disclosure of a promise of payment if there has been one.[19]

d. *The case as to Olsen.* Olsen entered the picture when employed by ASU as a stock salesman at the beginning of the second public offering (late June, 1964). In August, 1964, Van Horn, president of Commercial Capital Corporation (formerly Van Horn Associates) agreed to assist ASU and again began to sell stock to the public. Van Horn hired Olsen as a salesman for Commercial Capital, and Olsen later became sales manager.

---

[18]Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce H.R. Rep. No. 85, 73d Cong., 1st Sess. (1933) 24.

[19]See Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board (1961), 367 U.S. 1, 97-102; Lewis Publishing Co. v. Morgan (1913), 229 U.S. 288; United States v. Harris (1954), 347 U.S. 612; Burroughs v. United States (1934), 290 U.S. 534.

Olsen was charged in counts 10 to 38, the mailing dates ranging from July 3, 1964 to June 1, 1965. 23 of these counts were submitted to the jury. It convicted Olsen on counts 18, 23, 24, and 25, acquitting him on the others.

Count 18 involved a purchase of 200 shares by Mr. Perkins in October, 1964 from Commercial Capital. Olsen and Wymer called on him. They told him ASU would be in production at an early date, had about a year's work ahead, and had about a year's parts inventory completed, in the shop and paid for.

Count 23 involved a purchase of 200 shares by Mr. Whitney in December, 1964. Olsen told him the plane would cost $13,500 and that ASU had quite a few back orders.

Count 25 involved a purchase of 1,000 shares by Mr. and Mrs. Rauer in December. The shares were bought from Commercial Capital and the salesman was appellant Wymer. The price per share was $8.75. Wymer told the Rauers the stock would be worth $12 per share by spring and that ASU had enough backlog of orders to last two years at continuous production. The July 9, 1964 prospectus was given the Rauers.

The evidence establishes that at least by the time of these transactions, Olsen knew material adverse facts concerning the financial situation of the company and the lack of production, and should have known of the lack of firm orders for the plane. As sales manager of Commercial Capital he instructed its salesmen at sales meetings. We think that he could properly be convicted on counts 18 and 23 where he personally made false or misleading statements and failed to make necessary additional statements, and on Count 25 where the representations were not personally made by him, but by a salesman whom he instructed, and were consistent with the pattern of fraudulent conduct with which he was responsibly associated. Olsen had recommended Wymer to Van Horn for employment, saying Wymer was a good salesman "but also very fast in the field and should be watched with a very close eye".

Count 24 involved a purchase of 120 shares in December, 1964 from appellant Securities Services. Appellant Dowling was the salesman who dealt with the purchasers. We know of no evidence directly connecting Olsen with this transaction. We do not consider the evidence of his association with ASU or Commercial Capital in fraudulent conduct in the marketing of this stock to be sufficient proof of responsibility for the practices followed by Securities Services, although there is a brief reference to his having conducted one sales meeting for that company in the absence of appellant Mayne. We conclude that this conviction and sentence on this count must be set aside, although concurrent sentences remain in force.

e. *The case as to Wymer.* Wymer became a stock salesman for ASU in July, 1964, and was later employed by Commercial Capital.

Wymer was charged in counts 11 to 38, the mailing dates ranging from July 20, 1964 to June 1, 1965. 22 of these were submitted to the jury. He was convicted on counts 15, 18, and 25, and acquitted on the others.

Count 15 involved mailing by Commercial Capital to Mr. and Mrs. Riley on September 1, 1964 of a confirmation for 100 shares. Wymer had told Riley before he bought that ASU had thousands of orders and that production had just started. These statements were untrue and material, and of a type characteristic of the scheme.

Counts 18 and 25 have been described in d., above.

There is ample evidence that Wymer knew that the representations were untrue and intended that they persuade the prospective purchasers.

Wymer contends that the government failed to prove that the purchasers relied on the untrue statements. It is true that they did not testify that they believed and relied on his assertions.

Courts have said that in prosecutions under 15 U.S.C. §77q(a), at least where a fraudulent scheme was employed,

it is unnecessary to prove that a victim parted with money or property in reliance upon misrepresentations.[20]

Considering the language of the three subdivisions of 77q(a), it is clear that the activity proscribed by subdivisions (1) and (3) need not be successful to be unlawful, and reliance by a victim need not be proved. (1) proscribes the *employment* of a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud. (3) proscribes *engaging* in a transaction, practice, or course of business which *would operate* as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser as well as one which does. (2) deals specifically with untrue and misleading statements, but such statements are often elements or manifestations of a device, scheme, or artifice covered by (1) or of a transaction, practice or course of business covered by (3), so that when conduct unlawful under (1) or (3) has been proved it is not necessary to have proved conduct unlawful under (2). We conclude that proof of any degree of reliance was not required here.

It may be that the making of an untrue or misleading statement in the offer or sale of securities by the use of the mail or interstate telephone call might be so isolated from any other transaction that it would be unreasonable to deem it an element of a scheme or other conduct proscribed by (1) or (3). If so, the statement would not be unlawful under (2) unless it caused someone to part with his money or property. (2) declares it unlawful *to obtain* money or property *by means of* an untrue statement or material omission. Even in that instance, the victim's testimony that he relied would not be essential where causation could be inferred from all the circumstances.[21]

f. *The case as to Mayne.* David Mayne was president of Securities Services, Inc., a broker-dealer. In the fall of 1964 Van Horn discussed ASU stock with Mayne, and

---

[20]Farrell v. United States (9th Cir., 1963, 321 F2d 409, 419, cert. den. 375 U.S. 992; Frank v. United States (10th Cir., 1955), 220 F2d 559, 563; Bobbroff v. United States (9th Cir., 1953), 202 F2d 389, 391.

[21]See cases cited, 35 C.J.S., False Pretenses, §52, including People v. Gordon (Calif. C.A., 2d Dist., 1945), 163 P2d 110, 124; State v. Hastings (N.D., 1950), 41 NW2d 305; Corscot v. State (1922), 178 Wis. 661, 671, 178 NW 465.

a while later, Commercial Capital, Van Horn's company, supplied Securities Services with blocks of shares for resale. Securities Services sold stock amounting to more than $38,000 and Mayne himself sold $54,000.

Mayne and Securities Services were charged in counts 22-38, the mailing dates ranging from December 15, 1964 to June 1, 1965. Twelve of these were submitted to the jury. Mayne and his company were convicted on counts 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34, and acquitted on the others.

Count 24 (already referred to under d.) involved a sale of 120 shares to Mr. and Mrs. Shaffer. The confirmation was mailed December 24, 1964. Mr. Shaffer dealt personally with Dowling, an employee of Securities Services. Dowling told him ASU had three years' back orders. This was untrue and material and a part of the scheme-pattern. Shaffer bought additional shares on later occasions. The jury acquitted Dowling on this count. It may well have given him the benefit of a doubt on the fact that he was relatively new and should not at that stage be held criminally accountable for the fraudulent scheme. An acquittal of Dowling on that basis is not inconsistent with conviction of his employer.

Count 26 (already referred to under c.) involved a sale of 1,000 shares to Mrs. Stech. Confirmation was mailed January 21, 1965. In November Mr. Mayne made an appointment with her over the telephone. Mr. Dowling kept the appointment. Mrs. Stech bought 200 shares in December. Dowling arranged to take her to the Auto Show in Indianapolis in January. The plane was on display there.

The display at the Auto Show was part of a stock sales promotion planned by several appellants. Stock salesmen were active there. Mayne prepared some of the sales literature for use at the Auto Show.

A summary sheet prepared by Mayne represented that the plane was FAA certified; that the selling price was $13,390; that the products of ASU were then being distributed through 150 dealers; that approximately 3,500 planes had been ordered with dealer down payments; that

the backlog represented $47,000,000; and that $3,000 invested in ASU stock at various dates since September, 1963 was then worth $5,400. Each of these statements was untrue, or, at best, misleading unless qualified by additional statements which were omitted. This material was distributed at the show by Securities Services salesmen.

Mrs. Stech testified that Dowling pointed to a paper in the roof of the plane and said it was a certificate, and worth a million dollars. He told her the stock could not go down in price. He later told her he had 1,000 shares reserved for her, and that there was a firm in Canada that would take all they could get of it.

Count 29 involved a sale of 100 shares to Mr. and Mrs. Gilley. The certificate was mailed March 24, 1965. Mr. Gilley dealt personally with Mr. Von Foerster, a defendant not on trial, an employee of Securities Services. Mr. Von Foerster gave him a copy of the summary sheet prepared by Mayne and referred to under count 26, showed him an ASU stock sales booklet used by Mayne and other Securities Services salesmen, containing untrue and misleading statements of material facts, and orally made untrue or misleading statements concerning production plans and the price of the plane.

Count 30 involved a sale of 100 shares to Mr. Sears, with confirmation mailed March 24, 1965. Sears also dealt with Von Foerster and received the same summary sheet and was shown the same sales booklet as Mr. Gilley.

Count 32 involved a sale of 50 shares to Mr. and Mrs. Lang, with confirmation mailed April 5, 1965. Mr. Lang also dealt with Von Foerster, was shown the same sales booklet as Gilley and Sears, and was told untrue information about current production, back orders, and the price of the plane.

Count 33 involved a sale of 300 shares of Securities Services to Mr. and Mrs. Whitaker. The sale and the mailing of the certificate April 13, 1965 were proved. We find no evidence disclosing the information given. Conviction of Mayne and Securities Services on this count could rest only upon

an inference that a scheme to defraud frequently employed by them in the sale of a particular security was employed in every sale at about the same time. We consider this inference, under the circumstances of this case, too weak to constitute proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and conclude that conviction on this count must be set aside. The sentences on other counts, however, are concurrent.

Count 34 involved a sale of 50 shares by Securities Services to Mr. and Mrs. Wininger, with certificate mailed April 16, 1965. Mr. Wininger received the same summary sheet as Gilley and Sears.

Counts 24, 26, 29, 30, and 32 involved sales made by employees of Securities Services, of which Mayne was president. Mayne employed, instructed, and supervised these salesmen. He prepared and provided them with sales material containing untrue and misleading statements. There is, in our judgment, sufficient evidence upon which to find that he knew of the fraudulent character of the scheme which the salesman would employ[22] and intended that the prospective purchasers be persuaded to buy the stock. We conclude that the convictions of Mayne and Securities Services on these counts are adequately supported, and support the respective sentences.

g. *The case as to Dowling.* Dowling was a salesman for Securities Services in late 1964 and early 1965. He later became a salesman for Commercial Capital.

He was charged in counts 22 to 38, the mailing dates ranging from December 15, 1964 to June 1, 1965. Twelve of these were submitted to the jury. He was convicted on count 26 and acquitted on the others. The facts relevant to count 26 have been summarized above, in d. and f. We think the evidence supports the finding that he made the representations knowingly and wilfully.

h. *The case as to Riggs.* Mr. Riggs was manager of a life insurance agency. He became interested in ASU at the

---

[22]Mayne was surely in a position where he is deemed to have known that which could have been learned by inquiry reasonably to be expected. See cases cited infra. fn. 23.

Auto Show and approached Olsen about selling stock. They made a deal whereby Riggs and his salesmen would receive $1.50 per share of stock which they sold for Commercial Capital. At the time the price of the stock was $6 and Riggs was to pay $4.50.

Riggs was charged in counts 27 to 38, with mailing dates from February 8 to June 1, 1965. Seven of these counts were submitted to the jury. Riggs was convicted on count 38 and acquitted on other counts.

Count 38 involved a sale of 137 shares to Dr. Briggs. The confirmation was mailed June 1.

Dr. Briggs was a medical examiner for the life insurance company. He was first approached by James Dillon, one of Riggs' agents. Dillon said ASU stock was a good buy, and he showed pictures of the plane. Dr. Briggs telephoned Riggs to inquire about the stock. Riggs said it was scarce, was a good buy at $7 and would go up to $10 in a short time. He said about fifteen planes per month were being produced. This was untrue, as well as the representation that the stock was scarce. Briggs bought at $7. A week later he decided to buy more and found he could buy 625 shares through a local bank at $5.62½. Riggs could give no satisfactory answer when told of this. At about the same time as his sale to Briggs, or shortly before, Riggs had been buying ASU stock from a disinterested dealer at about $4.50 per share and selling it to investors at about $6.60 per share. Riggs had visited the plant and was aware that ceritification of the plane had been held up. Although there is no direct evidence that he was informed of the truth as to lack of production, he admitted that he did not know how many planes were being produced because "I heard all kinds of figures". We think that the jury's findings of wilfulness in misrepresenting production can properly rest upon the proposition that he recklessly made the representation for the purpose of inducing a purchase when he must have had

serious question what the facts were, but had failed to use reasonable means at hand to learn them.[23]

7. *Alleged bias of judge.* Appellants Vollmer and Indiana Investor suggest that the district judge ought to have recused himself, and that certain colloquies between the judge and their counsel deprecated counsel so as to diminish his effectiveness before the jury.

These appellants sought a change of venue, with an affidavit asserting that Judge Dillin had issued a preliminary injunction July 12, 1965 in a civil action brought by the SEC, alleging substantially the same facts as the indictment, and quoting Judge Dillin's oral findings adverse to these appellants. Judge Dillin found the application for change of venue insufficient and denied it.

Rulings and findings made by a judge in the course of a judicial proceeding are not in themselves sufficient reasons to believe that the judge has a personal bias or prejudice for or against a party.[24] The affidavit was insufficient to oust Judge Dillin under 28 U.S.C. §144.

These appellants set forth nine short excerpts from the record. Most were critical of some aspect of trial procedure being employed by counsel and some directed him to cease. Most of the admonitions seem to us to have been merited and appropriate in substance. We are not persuaded that they communicated to the jury any view held by the judge on the merits of the case nor that they in any way deprived these appellants of a fair trial.

8. *Challenge to SEC subpoenas.* Certain corporate records of Indiana Investor were used against it and against Vollmer. The government had obtained these records by an SEC subpoena issued pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §77s(b) and enforced by the district court, pursuant to §77v(b).

---

[23]See United States v. Ross (2d Cir., 1963), 321 F2d 61, 65, cert. den. 375 U.S. 894; Irwin v. United States (9th Cir., 1964), 338 F2d 770, 774, cert. den. 381 U.S. 911; United States v. Schaefer (7th Cir., 1962), 299 F2d 625, 629; United States v. Vasen (7th Cir., 1955), 222 F2d 3, 8, cert. den. 350 U.S. 834.

[24]Ex parte American Steel Barrel Co. and Seaman (1913), 230 U.S. 35, 43; Tucker v. Kerner (7th Cir., 1950), 186 F2d 79, 84.

Appellants Vollmer and Indiana Investor claim that the judicial compulsion exercised was an unreasonable seizure under the Fourth Amendment. No claim is made that the records were other than corporate.

It may well be that any challenge now made became foreclosed by the adverse result of the judicial proceeding which resulted in enforcement of the subpoena. In any event, the subpoena was not the general subpoena dealt with in *Hale v. Henkel*[25] upon which appellants rely. The answer to their claim is summarized in *Oklahoma Press Pub. Co. v. Walling* as follows:

> "[T]he Fifth Amendment affords no protection by virtue of the self-incrimination provision, whether for the corporation or for its officers; and the Fourth, if applicable, at the most guards against abuse only by way of too much indefiniteness or breadth in the things required to be 'particularly described,' if also the inquiry is one the demanding agency is authorized by law to make and the materials specified are relevant. The gist of the protection is in the requirement, expressed in terms, that the disclosure sought shall not be unreasonable."[26]

9. *Other claims of error upon trial.* We have examined other claims of error in rulings and instructions, but find no merit in any.

10. *Irving's claims.* Appellant K. K. Irving was president of ASU and active in its organization and management. He was charged in all counts except count 39. On June 1, 1967, just before the trial, and when accompanied by his counsel, he entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to 21 counts. After the trial, on July 28, 1967, at the same time others were sentenced, the court found him guilty on counts 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, and 21. He was sentenced to five years on count 10, and two years on each other count. The

---

[25](1906), 201 U.S. 43, 77.

[26](1946), 327 U.S. 186, 208. See Penfield Co. of Cal. v. Securities and Exch. Com'n (9th Cir., 1944), 143 Fld 746.

term on count 12 was consecutive to that on count 10, and all other terms were concurrent with that on count 12.

Mr. Irving raises challenges, as do other appellants, to the grand jury, the indictment, refusal of severance and denial of continuance on account of pretrial publicity. Apparently he considers that his plea does not foreclose the latter contentions on the theory that immediate joint trial subjected him to pressures which made his plea involuntary. As already set forth, we deem all these claims insufficient.

Mr. Irving also challenges the propriety of the sentences on several other grounds, which we now consider.

Irving claims that the court improperly considered the evidence heard at trial. Under the circumstances, where the plea was entered the morning the trial was to begin, and further consideration of the plea was postponed, it would seem very likely that the court would consider the evidence at trial to the extent it bore upon the charges to which Irving had pleaded *nolo contendere*. It is clear the court did consider the evidence at the criminal trial in determining that there was a prima facie showing that the offenses charged had been committed. Irving appears to claim, however, that a colloquy just after the plea was entered included an understanding that the court was limited to evidence it recalled from the earlier civil litigation and to Irving's own testimony in the SEC investigation. Although those sources were mentioned as appropriate for consideration by the court in making findings of guilt, we can find no limitation to them or exclusion of evidence at trial, express or implied. Indeed counsel for Irving said, in the course of the colloquy: ". . . my understanding was that . . . and I indicated to Mr. Stein [the United States attorney] that the evidence that the Court would hear in the pending case . . . it was my understanding with Mr. Stein that that could be used for the purposes that were indicated."

The second claim is that assertions made by the court at the hearing prior to the pronouncement of sentence

showed that the court relied on erroneous information. The colloquy between the court and Mr. Irving after counsel had spoken amounts to fifteen pages of transcript. The court outlined several adverse factors: That Irving and others had committed a deliberate fraud on the reorganization court in Florida; that Irving had misrepresented in that court his ability and willingness to commit a million dollars worth of assets to ASU if necessary; had misrepresented that no public offering of stock was contemplated in the near future; and had joined in an improper agreement to give Mr. Umbaugh an interest in ASU.

Three of the allegedly erroneous accusations relate to the above matters. The differences between Irving and the court in these respects are matters of interpretation of and choice of inferences from facts which were thoroughly established.

The court also stated that although Irving claimed to have lost $200,000 in ASU, figures worked out at the court's request, apparently by the government, indicated he came out a little better than even.

Mr. Irving was given an opportunity to respond to all the court's assertions and he succeeded in convincing the court that the computations were in error and that he had suffered a loss exceeding $150,000. The error was acknowledged by the court before sentence was pronounced.

The third claim is that the seven year total sentence is substantially longer than those imposed in a number of reported cases. The government counters with citations of securities fraud cases where the terms were longer than seven years. Disparity in sentences is not a predicate for appellate review.

11. *McQuinn's claims.* Mr. McQuinn was a stock salesman employed by ASU in the summer of 1964. He was charged in counts 7 to 17, with mailing dates from April 8, 1964 to September 29, 1964. He entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to eleven counts and was found guilty on counts 16 and 17.

He raises only challenges which have already been disposed of.

12. *Nash's claims.* Mr. Nash was sales manager for ASU and had previously been employed by Umbaugh. He was charged in every count except count 39. On June 1, 1967 (at the same time as Irving) he pleaded *nolo contendere* to 21 counts. On July 28, the court found him guilty on counts 10, 14, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and sentenced him to concurrent terms, the longest being five years on count 10. Nash appeared without counsel on June 1 and July 28. In August, counsel filed a motion on his behalf to set aside the conviction and for leave to withdraw the plea. The court set aside the conviction and sentences, apparently because the record did not affirmatively indicate waiver of counsel on July 28, but denied leave to withdraw the plea. On October 26, the court found Nash guilty on counts 10, 14, 19, 20, and 21 and sentenced him to concurrent terms, the longest being four years on count 10. All other counts were dismissed or findings of acquittal made.

Mr. Nash makes contentions similar to some of those made by Mr. Irving and other appellants and already disposed of. In addition he contends in his brief on appeal that the district court "committed error in holding that [he] waived the right to counsel at the time he entered his plea of *nolo contendere*". He also asserts that when his conviction was set aside he gained the right to liberality in considering his request for leave to withdraw his plea. We do not find the latter argument very persuasive where the conviction was set aside, as here, on grounds arising after the plea. We observe, also, that Nash is not justly entitled, unless there be good reason, to put the government to a long and repetitious trial which would not have been necessary if Nash had maintained his plea of not guilty and stood trial as scheduled.

We conclude that there was a sufficient waiver of counsel at the time the plea was entered. The facts are, in substance, as follows:

Mr. Van Orman, who is Nash's counsel on this appeal,

filed an appearance as counsel for Nash in the district court July 22, 1966, and continued to represent him until April 14, 1967 when the court permitted Van Orman to withdraw. Van Orman had made motions on behalf of Nash and had appeared April 3 at a pretrial conference. The trial date of May 31 (later postponed one day) was then set. Nash appeared May 29 and requested a continuance in order to seek counsel. The continuance was denied. He appeared May 31 and June 1 without counsel.

On the morning of June 1, Nash, Irving, and Mr. Kightlinger, Irving's counsel, were before the court. Mr. Kightlinger stated that he had explained the plea about to be entered to his client and that since Nash was not represented, he had, upon request by Nash, "given him advice as to the effect of the plea which he desires to make". After asking and obtaining Nash's permission, Kightlinger said he was entering *nolo contendere* pleas for both. The court then carefully and precisely explained the meaning, effect and consequences of a *nolo contendere* plea. It has not been claimed, nor could it be, that there was any deficiency in compliance with Rule 11, F.R.Cr.P.

After full explanation, the court said: "Now, Mr. Nash is not represented by counsel this morning, but in the past he at one time had counsel. Counsel withdrew his appearance, stating at that time that Mr. Nash was financially able to hire counsel but had not completed his arrangements with counsel. Mr. Nash has never indicated to the Court that he is not financially able to hire counsel. He has appeared here as his own counsel on one or two occasions, the last being yesterday morning, so counsel has not been appointed for Mr. Nash. It has been my finding or opinion, as things have gone, that he has elected to represent himself. Is that right, Mr. Nash?" Mr. Nash replied, "Yes, Your Honor."

The court then inquired as to their pleas. Each pleaded *nolo contendere*. The court accepted the pleas, but stated he would make no finding until he heard something to prove the corpus delicti. The discussion concerning the source of proof, already referred to, followed.

There would be a serious problem if this were a typical arraignment and the court said no more about the availability and usefulness of counsel. But here we think the court could rely upon the earlier proceedings, and that Nash's reply, in these circumstances, was a sufficient waiver of counsel.

Our conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the motion, prepared and filed by Nash's counsel in August, neither claims any lack of understanding about the nature of the charge or the consequences of the plea nor that he did not intelligently waive counsel.

We think that Nash has failed to show that withdrawal of the plea is necessary to correct manifest injustice, and that there was no unfairness or abuse of discretion in denying such leave.

The convictions and sentences of appellant Olsen on count 24, and of appellants Mayne and Securities Services on count 33 are set aside. In all other respects the judgments appealed from are affirmed.

A true Copy:

Teste:

.....

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

United States Court of Appeals

For The Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

Monday, MARCH 29, 1971

Before

Hon. THOMAS E. FAIRCHILD, Circuit Judge

Hon. WALTER J. CUMMINGS, Circuit Judge

Hon. OTTO KERNER, Circuit Judge

United States Of America,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

Nos. 17084, 17085, 17086, 17091, 17092, 17094, 17095.

vs.

FRED G. AMICK, *et al.*,
Defendants- Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division.

IT IS ORDERED by the Court that the petitions for rehearing filed by defendants-appellants Fred G. Amick, Francis L. Broderick, William M. Dowling, H. R. Nash, Walter C. Olsen, Harold L. Wymer, Van C. Vollmer, and Indiana Investor and Business News, Inc., be and the same are hereby denied.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES V. RABINOWITZ, 366 F.2d 34, (5th Cir., 1966)

MOBLEY V. UNITED STATES, 379 F. 2d 768 (5th Cir., 1967)

UNITED STATES V. COHEN, 275 F. Supp. 724 (1967)

UNITED STATES V. HUNT, 265 F. Supp. 178 (W. D. Texas, 1967)

HANSON V. UNITED STATES, 393 F. 2d (10th Cir., 1968)

UNITED STATES V. LEONETTE, 291 F. Supp. 461 (S.D. N.Y., 1968)

UNITED STATES V. VALENTINE, 288 F. Supp. 957 (D Puerto Rico, 1968)

KING V. COOK, 297 F. Supp. 99 (N.D. Miss., 1969)

SALISBURG V. GRIMES, 406 F. 2d 50, (5th Cir., 1969)

SANDERS V. UNITED STATES, 415 F. 2d 621 (5th Cir., 1969)

WITCHER V. PEYTON, 405 F. 2d 725 (4th Cir., 1969)

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned being first duly sworn upon his oath hereby certifies that prior to the filing of Petition For Certiorari in forty (40) copies of Petitioner, Fred G. Amick, with the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, he forwarded two (2) copies thereof to each counsel of record for plaintiff-appellees, respectively, in the United States Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, by first class postage prepaid United States mail, to-wit:

Solicitor General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C., 20530

Attorney General of
United States
Appeal Section, Dept. of Justice
Washington, D. C., 20530

Erle A. Kightlinger, Attorney
6th Floor, First Federal Bldg.
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Thomas W. McKean, Attorney
6th Floor, Inland Bldg.
156 East Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Duge Butler, Jr., Attorney
Room 400, 156 E. Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

John D. Raikos, Attorney
120 East Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Sidney Mishkin, Attorney
500 Federal Bldg., 45 N. Pennsylvania St.
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Hon. Stanley Miller
United States District Attorney
Room 246, Federal Building
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204


William Hegan, Attorney
Room 1708, 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois, 60604

Earl N. Davis, Attorney
6th Floor, Inland Bldg.
156 East Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

James W. Bradford, Attorney
1009 Merchants Bank Bldg.
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Alan I. Klineman, Attorney
1122 Circle Tower
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204

Jerome B. Van Orman, Attorney
1102 Fort Wayne Bank Bldg.
Fort Wayne, Indiana, 46802




Vance M. Waggoner
130 East 2nd Street
Rushville, Indiana, 46173
Telephone: (317) 932-2602

Attorney for Petitioner,
Fred G. Amick.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1971.

My Commission expires:
January 9, 1974.



Irene R. Neuman, Notary Public

INDEX

	Page
Opinion below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions presented	2
Statement	3
Argument	6
Conclusion	15

CITATIONS

Cases:

Barnard v. *United States*, 16 F. 2d 451, certiorari denied, 274 U.S. 736	8
Bell v. *United States*, 100 F. 2d 474	8
Blitz v. *United States*, 153 U.S. 308	8
Crain v. *United States*, 162 U.S. 625	7, 8
Gold v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 985	12
Halliday v. *United States*, 394 U.S. 831	15
Johnson v. *United States*, 207 F. 2d 314, certiorari denied, 347 U.S. 938	11
McCarthy v. *United States*, 394 U.S. 459	15
Morgan v. *United States*, 399 F. 2d 93, certiorari denied, 393 U.S. 1025	11
Parker v. *United States*, 252 F. 2d 680, certiorari denied, 356 U.S. 964	8
Remmer v. *United States*, 347 U.S. 227	12
Remmer v. *United States*, 350 U.S. 377	12
United States v. *Crummer*, 151 F. 2d 958	7
United States v. *Greenberg*, 30 F.R.D. 164	7, 8
United States v. *Lennon*, 246 F. 2d 24, certiorari denied, 355 U.S. 836	7
United States v. *McGuire*, 381 F. 2d 306	8
United States v. *Shavin*, 287 F. 2d 647	8
United States v. *Sorcey*, 151 F. 2d 899, certiorari denied, 327 U.S. 794	11-12
United States v. *Warner*, 428 F. 2d 730	7
Vandersee v. *United States*, 321 F. 2d 57	8
Weiss v. *United States*, 122 F. 2d 675	7
Wheaton v. *United States*, 133 F. 2d 522	12

Statutes and rule:

	Page
Securities Act of 1933:	
Section 17(a), 15 U.S.C. 77q(a)	3, 7
18 U.S.C. 371	3
18 U.S.C. 4208(a)(2)	3
Rule 7(c) F.R.Cr.P.	8

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

No. 1617

LEON O. RIGGS, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 1635

FRED G. AMICK, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 1637

H. R. NASH, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 6964

DAVID R. MAYNE, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (see Amick Petition No. 1635, pp. 1a-33a) is not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on January 22, 1971. Petitions for rehearing were denied on March 29, 1971. Petitions for writs of certiorari were filed by Riggs on April 23, 1971, by Amick and Nash on April 26, 1971, and by Mayne on April 27, 1971. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether there was reversible error in the manner in which the indictment was drawn or in the fact that language used in count one, which was dismissed by the trial court, was incorporated by reference in other counts upon which convictions were obtained (No. 1635).

2. Whether the grand and petit juries were improperly selected because a substantial part of the array was chosen by the "keyman" system (Nos. 1635 and 1637).

3. Whether, after a thorough exploration of the fact that shortly before trial a co-defendant inquired indirectly if a juror might be prejudiced against him, the court properly concluded that the incident did not justify a mistrial (Nos. 1617 and 6964).

4. Whether the evidence supported the conviction of petitioner Amick (No. 1635).

5. Whether the trial court erred in refusing to vacate a plea of *nolo contendere* entered by petitioner Nash (No. 1637).

STATEMENT

An indictment returned in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana charged petitioners and others in various substantive counts with fraud in the offer and sale of securities and of conspiracy to commit these offenses, in violation of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. 77q(a), and of 18 U.S.C. 371 (App. 36-75). Prior to trial, petitioner Nash entered a plea of *nolo contendere* as to a portion of the charges; the other charges against him were then dismissed. After a trial by jury, the remaining petitioners were convicted on various substantive counts; all were acquitted on the conspiracy charge. Sentences subject to the parole eligibility provisions of 18 U.S.C. 4208 (a)(2), were imposed as follows: Riggs, a total of three years (App. 316-317)[1]; Amick, a total of six years (App. 303-304); Nash, a total of four years (App. 313-314); and Mayne, a total of four years (App. 308-309). The court of appeals affirmed, except that it set aside the conviction of Mayne on a count upon which a concurrent sentence had been imposed (Amick Pet. 33a).

The charges arose out of fraudulent conduct of petitioners in various offerings of stock by Air and

[1] "App." refers to appellants' two-volume Appendix in the court of appeals which we are lodging herewith.

Space Underwriters, Inc. (ASU), a corporation formed in May 1963 to take over the business of Umbaugh Aircraft, which prior to institution of bankruptcy proceedings in 1962, had been engaged through a subsidiary in developing a gyroplane (an aircraft roughly similar to a helicopter). Amick was chairman of the board of ASU until his resignation in January 1965; Riggs was a salesman of the stock of ASU; Nash was sales manager for the gyroplane and active in the sale of ASU stock; and Mayne was president of Securities Services, a corporate defendant which was active in the sale of ASU stock.

In late April or early May of 1963, Amick and codefendant Irving [2] proposed to Raymond E. Umbaugh, president of Umbaugh Aircraft, that ASU be formed to take over its business. Umbaugh agreed to support the plan, in return for a substantial block of ASU stock. Amick and Irving represented to the bankruptcy court that they and their associates would finance the program, estimated by Irving to amount to $1,500,000. On the day before the submission of the plan to the bankruptcy court an attorney advised Amick, Umbaugh and others that the transfer of a block of ASU stock to Umbaugh would be in direct violation of an earlier order of the bankruptcy court that Umbaugh could have no interest in any successor to the bankrupt corporation (Tr. 595-596, 3405).[3] To overcome this obstacle, one Streets, a distributor of Umbaugh Aircraft stock, was substituted for Um-

---

[2] Irving has a pending petition for a writ of certiorari (No. 1375, this Term) to which we have separately responded.

[3] "Tr." refers to the multi-volumed trial transcript.

baugh; the latter, however, remained an undisclosed principal (Tr. 597).

At a hearing in the bankruptcy court on July 22, 1963, which Amick attended, Irving testified that his personal net worth was about $1,000,000 and he was prepared to use that amount to finance the reorganization plan. He also stated that he had associates, including relatives, who would provide an additional $1,000,000. He further testified that no arrangement existed for Umbaugh to receive property or other payment in connection with the reorganization, and that he had not dealt with Umbaugh and knew of no one interested in the plan who had been dealing with Umbaugh. Both Amick and Irving remained silent while their attorney represented to the court that ASU had no present arrangement for a public issuance of stock (Defdt. Exh. 126-127, 134-135, 148-150, 152, 153). The actual fact was that Umbaugh was involved and that Amick and his associates had previously made plans for the issuance of the stock (Tr. 3407, 3421, 3494-3495, 3498, 3501).

One week later (July 29, 1963) arrangements for a public offering of stock were completed at an ASU board meeting (Tr. 603, 612-613). The first sale of stock was made on August 14, 1963, the day on which the bankruptcy court entered its formal order approving the amended reorganization plan (Defdt. Exh. E). Between August 1963 and July 1965, in excess of $2,100,000 worth of stock was publicly sold through the efforts of petitioners. These sales were accompanied by numerous misrepresentations concerning such matters as the number of orders which

existed for the gyroplane, its price, and actual and anticipated production plans. At the same time, petitioners failed to disclose, *inter alia*, the serious financial difficulties being experienced by the company in its operations. In summarizing the record in this regard, the court below stated (Amick Pet. No. 1635, p. 2a):

> It appears, virtually beyond dispute, that during this period [of the public offerings] the effort to promote sales of ASU stock included general releases and individual communications which contained untrue statements of material facts, omitted material facts necessary to make the statements made not misleading, and included devices to defraud and practices which would operate as a fraud upon the purchaser. * * *

ARGUMENT

1. The opening paragraph of count 1 charged, in the language of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933,[4] that Amick and other named defendants in the offer and sale of securities "(1) did employ devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud; (2) did obtain money and property by means of untrue statements of material facts and omissions to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (3) did engage in transactions, practices, and courses of business which would and did operate as a fraud and deceit

[4] The statute is set out in the Amick Petition No. 1635 at p. 5.

upon purchasers of the common stock of ASU * * *" (App. 36-37). This general statement was followed by a particularized account of the development and execution of the overall plan (App. 37-50), the false representations which were made, specifying 14 instances (App. 50-51), and the failure to state material facts, specifying ten instances (App. 51-52). It was alleged in paragraph 4 of that count that Amick and certain named co-defendants on a described occasion used the mails in the furtherance of the plan (App. 52-53). Counts 2 through 38 were identical with count 1 as to paragraphs 1-3 of that count incorporating those paragraphs by reference; the critical difference was that each of the remaining counts varied as to the co-defendants named with Amick and charged a separate use of the mail for the sale of securities to separate purchasers (App. 53-68).

a. Contrary to the contention of petitioner Amick (Amick Pet. 11-13), the counts were not rendered duplicitous because each method of violating 15 U.S.C. 77q(a) was charged in the conjunctive in each count.[5] See *Crain* v. *United States*, 162 U.S. 625, 634; *United States* v. *Lennon*, 246 F. 2d 24 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 355 U.S. 836; *United States* v. *Warner*, 428 F. 2d 730, 735 (C.A. 8); *United States* v. *Greenberg*, 30 F.R.D. 164, 169 (S.D. N.Y.); *Weiss* v. *United States*, 122 F. 2d 675, 680-681 (C.A. 5); *United States* v. *Crummer*, 151 F. 2d 958, 963-964 (C.A. 10). An indictment so framed does not prejudice an accused, because a verdict of guilty upon

[5] Amick was convicted on eight of the twenty-seven counts which had been submitted to the jury.

proof that the accused has done any of the acts charged will act as a bar to subsequent prosecution for any of the matters therein alleged. *Crain* v. *United States, supra*, 162 U.S. at 636. As the court below held (Amick Pet. 6a-7a), the indictment here clearly met the requirements that it apprise the accused with reasonable certainty of the nature of the charges against him, so that he could prepare his defense and be able to plead the judgment as a bar to any subsequent prosecution for the same offense. Cf. *Vandersee* v. *United States*, 321 F. 2d 57 (C.A. 3); *United States* v. *McGuire*, 381 F. 2d 306, 318-319 (C.A. 2); *United States* v. *Greenberg, supra.*

b. Under Rule 7(c), F. R. Crim. P., "[a]llegations made in one count may be incorporated by reference in another count." Petitioner Amick contends that the language incorporated here lost its vitality since count one was dismissed (Amick Pet. 13-15). The governing law is to the contrary. Failure of proof as to the count setting forth the allegations *in full* does not vitiate the other counts which adopted its language. *Blitz* v. *United States*, 153 U.S. 308, 317; *Crain* v. *United States, supra*, 162 U.S. at 633; *United States* v. *Shavin*, 287 F. 2d 647, 650 (C.A. 7); *Parker* v. *United States*, 252 F. 2d 680 (C.A. 6), certiorari denied, 356 U.S. 964; *Bell* v. *United States*, 100 F. 2d 474 (C.A. 5); *Barnard* v. *United States*, 16 F. 2d 451 (C.A. 9), certiorari denied, 274 U.S. 736.

2. Challenges to the manner in which the grand and petit juries were selected (Amick Pet. 15-19, Nash Pet. 33-34) are answered in the government's

brief in opposition to *Irving* v. *United States*, No. 1375 this Term, pp. 9-12; we are sending copies of this brief to petitioners' counsel.

3. After the jury had been impaneled, but before the trial had begun, the court told counsel that there had been an occurrence with regard to one of the jurors which he was going to investigate (App. 609). He then questioned the juror in chambers, with only the court reporter present. The juror said that, over the weekend, co-defendant Vollmer[6] had telephoned the juror's business associate and had asked him if he thought that the juror remembered Vollmer in connection with a past business transaction. The associate communicated this information to the juror, who told the court that he had no recollection of Vollmer or the business transaction. The associate had informed Vollmer that he was certain that the juror would give him fair consideration as to any matter that might arise at trial. The juror said that he did not feel that this occurrence would in any way influence his verdict (App. 610-611).

After the reporter read the transcript of this interview to counsel, the court asked for suggestions as to the proper procedure. Counsel for petitioner Mayne moved for dismissal of the jury; the court rejected this approach noting that "it would be an easy way to keep from getting tried, particularly in a conspiracy case, to take turns creating prejudice, and nobody ever gets tried" (App. 612-614). The court stated that the juror did not have the impression that

[6] Vollmer has also filed a petition for a writ of certiorari (No. 1678, this Term) which we are responding to separately.

anyone was trying to influence him and had reported the incident to the court because of his previous answers on *voir dire* that he knew nothing about the case (App. 615). Counsel for petitioner Riggs moved for a severance (App. 624-625). When the court overruled this motion, Riggs moved to substitute the alternate juror (App. 629); such substitution was opposed by Amick (App. 629, 631) and Vollmer wished to continue the trial with the jury as constituted (App. 627). The court outlined what it would say to the jury, to which there was no objection (App. 629-632). The court then called in the jury and advised them as follows (App. 637):

> Members of the Jury, we have had a little incident happen, as sometimes happens in the trial of cases. One of the parties, over the week-end, contacted an acquaintance and asked him a question which required the acquaintance to ask a member of the jury for the answer, thus, of course, bringing to the attention of the juror the party who asked the question in the first place. The juror very properly related this to the Clerk, who related it to me, and I have now made it known to the attorneys. And, having considered the matter very carefully, it seems to me that nothing improper was intended. It was an impropriety. It shouldn't have been done—an irregularity, if you want to call it that, but I think nothing more than that. But I mention it to you as something that you should know about. It is possible that more will be made of it than is justifiable. In case any of this should come to your attention—although it shouldn't—I thought I would make that state-

> ment. It is explanatory of what has occupied me and the lawyers for the last several minutes, and, also, it is illustrative of what I keep telling you in my admonitions at times that we take a recess—that you are not to form or express an opinion about the case, that you are not to discuss it with yourselves or others or permit others to discuss it with you or in your hearing or presence, and I frequently add to that if anyone does attempt to discuss the case with you or in your hearing or presence, you should promptly report it.
>
> And a prompt report was made in this case. I think on thorough reflection, that nothing improper was intended, although, as I say, it was an irregularity on the part of the person who did it, which I am sure will not be repeated by any party to this action. So, with that little statement, we will go on with the trial of the case. I am sure nothing out of the way will happen in the future; but if anything does, please report it promptly.

Considering the differing views of counsel and the tangential nature of the incident it was well within the court's discretion to instruct the jury as it did and then proceed with the trial. The court's statement was low-keyed and avoided any possible prejudice by pointing out that "nothing improper was intended." There can be no presumption of prejudice from this inconsequential occurrence. See, *e.g.*, *Morgan* v. *United States*, 399 F. 2d 93, 96-97 (C.A. 5), certiorari denied, 393 U.S. 1025; *Johnson* v. *United States*, 207 F. 2d 314 (C.A. 5), certiorari denied, 347 U.S. 938; *United States* v. *Sorcey*, 151 F. 2d 899

(C.A. 7), certiorari denied, 327 U.S. 794; *Wheaton* v. *United States*, 133 F. 2d 522, 527 (C.A. 8).[7]

4. The contention that the evidence was insufficient to sustain the conviction of petitioner Amick (Amick Pet. 19-22), who was at the center of the operation, is fully answered by the opinion of the court below upon which we rely (Amick Pet. 13a-16a).

5. On the day this case was set for trial, petitioner Nash and co-defendant Irving elected to withdraw their pleas of not guilty and to plead *nolo contendere* to certain counts of the indictment. Erle Kightlinger, appearing for defendant Irving, stated that Nash was not represented by counsel but that he had advised him as to the effect of such a plea. With the express permission of Nash, Kightlinger stated the counts to which the plea would be entered (App. 486-487). Addressing both defendants, the court explained the possible penalties that could be

---

[7] *Remmer* v. *United States*, 347 U.S. 227; 350 U.S. 377; is clearly distinguishable. In that case an unidentified person suggested to a juror that an acquittal would be profitable for him. The court took the matter up with the prosecution alone and an F.B.I. agent questioned the juror. The defense learned of the incident only after the trial was over, by reading of it in a newspaper. In that particular context, where the juror admitted to being under "terrific pressure," this court held that it could not be said that the juror was unaffected in his freedom of action. 350 U.S. at 381. *Gold* v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 985, is comparable to *Remmer*. Neither decision is apposite to this case, where the juror attached no significance to the telephone call and the lawyer for the party who had made the call wanted to continue the trial without substitution of the alternate.

imposed, the right to trial by jury, the presumption of innocence, the right to participate in the selection of the jury and to make challenges and the nature of the plea of *nolo contendere* (App. 488-490). The court further said (App. 490):

> Now, Mr. Nash is not represented by counsel this morning, but in the past he at one time had counsel. Counsel withdrew his appearance, stating at that time Mr. Nash was financially able to hire counsel but had not completed his arrangements with counsel. Mr. Nash has never indicated to the Court that he is not financially able to hire counsel. He has appeared here as his own counsel on one or two occasions, the last being yesterday morning, so counsel has not been appointed for Mr. Nash. It has been my finding or opinion, as things have gone, that he has elected to represent himself. Is that right, Mr. Nash?

Petitioner answered affirmatively. He further stated that no one had made any representations that his plea would affect the sentence imposed; the court responded that any such representation would have been false (App. 491-492). In the colloquy which followed, Mr. Kightlinger stated that it had been his understanding with the assistant United States Attorney that the court might consider the evidence to be heard in the trial as constituting the factual basis for the plea. It was also understood that the evidence already heard by the court in a related civil action might furnish this basis (App. 492-494). All parties were sentenced after the conclusion of the trial. The court found Nash guilty on the basis of

his plea, the evidence heard by the court in the prior civil action, and upon the evidence heard at this trial; he was sentenced to imprisonment for five years. Nash was not represented at the sentencing and did not specifically waive counsel at that time (App. 509, 563).

Nash thereafter moved to set aside the judgment of conviction and to withdraw his plea of *nolo contendere* (1) because it had been agreed that the factual basis of his plea was the evidence in the civil suit, which was alleged to be inadequate to show his guilt, and (2) because he was not represented by counsel at sentencing (App. 350-354). The court refused permission to withdraw the plea beause no adequate ground therefor was stated, but held that, since petitioner did not specifically waive counsel at sentencing, he should be re-sentenced (App. 354-356). Petitioner was thereafter re-sentenced to four years' imprisonment (App. 313-314).

The crux of petitioner's present complaint—a matter which he did not raise in his original motion to withdraw his plea—is that he was denied counsel at the time of his plea. As the facts show, however, that was not the case at all. Nash, who earlier had retained counsel, chose to represent himself at the time of the plea, although he was financially able to employ counsel. Despite his vague allegations that he was promised leniency in exchange for his plea, nothing in the record supports such a claim, and he unequivocally denied at the hearing that any such representations had been made. The voluntariness of petitioner's plea was properly determined at the orig-

inal hearing, and affirmed by the court below.[8] There is no reason for plenary review of that claim by this Court.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the petitions for writs of certiorari should be denied.

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
Solicitor General.

WILL WILSON,
Assistant Attorney General.

BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
KIRBY W. PATTERSON,
Attorneys.

JUNE 1971.

---

[8] In an addendum to its denial of the petitions for rehearing, the court below stated that although the district court had "carefully explained the consequence of the plea," it had "omitted explanation of the nature of the charge." The court of appeals held, however, that since the plea was entered before the decision in *McCarthy* v. *United States*, 394 U.S. 459, there was no automatic requirement that Nash be allowed to plead anew. *Halliday* v. *United States*, 394 U.S. 831 (Nash Pet. No. 1637, pp. 34a-35a). The fact that Nash had been represented by counsel at an earlier stage of the proceedings and that he had entered his plea after consultation with defendant Irving's counsel supports the view that he understood the nature of the charges against him.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1971 426651 692